DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 147 UD 024 770

AUTHOR Sparks, Mary; Markowitch, Anne
TITLE Tracking Federal Dollars. Categorical Grants, Block Grants, and the Issue of a Fair Share for the Poor of Illinois.
INSTITUTION Hull House Association, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Chicago Dept. of Human Services, IL.; Joyce Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 91p.; Document contains small, light type.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Block Grants; *Categorical Aid; *Federal Aid; *Poverty; *Resource Allocation; Social Services
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This study tracks Federal block grant monies and their impact on the poor of Illinois. The hypothesis prompting the study was that the state has distributed a smaller proportion of its Federal block grant funds to those counties with the highest proportion of the state's poor as compared with the proportional distribution of Federal dollars under categorical programs. Six of the nine grants allocated by Congress were studied: home energy assistance, community services, maternal and child health, preventive health and health services, mental health and drug abuse, and Title XX - social services. The major findings were: (1) The 28 counties studied comprise 80.6% of the poverty population of the state and received only 66.9% of the Federal funds under the block grant system, compared to 69.8% under the Federal categorical system. (2) Overall, from 1980 to 1984, there were no significant advances toward a fair share for the 15 counties with the largest proportion of poor, either under a categorical or block grant system. (3) While most of the counties studied fall into the fair share range, some received more than their fair share while others received less. (4) Of the two counties having the highest proportion of poor, Cook County fared worse in the block grant years than in the categorical years, a negative difference of 5.5% while St. Clair improved in the block grant years, a positive difference of 1.0%. The body of the report presents and analyzes tables of data comparing and contrasting the two forms of grants. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Seng
Hull House Assoc.
Research + Advocacy Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TRACKING FEDERAL DOLLARS

Categorical Grants, Block Grants,
and the Issue of a Fair Share
for the Poor of Illinois

Prepared by: The Research and Advocacy Department
Hull House Association
May 1985

Principle Investigator: Dr. Mary Sparks
Project Coordinator/Editor: Anne Markowitch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE i

HYPOTHESIS. 1

METHODOLOGY 2

Data Collection 3
"Fair Share" Concept 4

MAJOR FINDINGS 5

PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 9

CUMULATIVE TABLES FOR GRANT PROGRAMS STUDIED 12

MAJOR CITIES WITHIN COUNTIES STUDIED 14

INDIVIDUAL CATEGORICAL AND BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

Home Energy Assistance (Tables 1 and 2). 16
Community Services (Tables 3 and 4). 22
Maternal and Child Health (Tables 5 and 6) 26
Preventive Health and Health Services (Tables 7 and 8) 30
Mental Health Programs (Tables 9 and 10) 36
Drug Abuse Programs (Tables 11 and 12) 39
Title XX - Donated Funds Initiative - Summary (Tables 13 and 14) . . .46

ALLIED AGENCIES: Tables for Title XX Donated Funds Initiative

Department of Aging (Tables 15 and 16) 53
Department of Children andFamily Services (Tables 17 and 18) 55
Delinquency Prevention (Tables 19 and 20). 57
Department of Corrections (Tables 21 and 22) 59
Dangerous Drugs Commission (Tables 23 and 24). 61
Department of Mental Health (Tables 25 and 26). 63
Department of Public Aid (Tables 27 and 28). 65
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (Tables 29 and 30) 67

FAIR SHARE COMPARISONS: CATEGORICAL AND BLOCK GRANTS 69

PREFACE

This report is provided by Hull House Association as a public service. It is dedicated to the many public-spirited citizens and citizen organizations throughout the State of Illinois. There is no substitute in a democracy for a well informed citizenry.

This study concerns itself with questions of equity in the distribution and allocation of resources. It calls upon citizens and policy makers in both the legislative and executive branches of state government to abandon geographical rivalries and narrow self interests. It asks us to deal with basic human needs in terms of justice and equity.

It would indeed be unfortunate and unproductive if the findings of this study intensify petty turfism rather than expand our determination and our efforts to address human needs with justice and fairness. There is, no doubt, a need for a more rational and equitable distribution system. This need should be addressed in Illinois.

The solution, however, should not be to ameliorate poverty in one county at the expense of another county. With a modest increase in overall resources, the inequities between counties could be eradicated, without doing so at anyone else's expense. The resources are both inadequate and are distributed inequitably. Whether the source of the increased resources be state or federal cannot be addressed here, but ultimately the source of all these resources is the taxpayers, the citizens. I believe that social justice, fairness, is a basic and enduring passion of the citizens of this country and this state.

There are many who have contributed to this study. I wish to thank them all, and am compelled to name some.

Although we received some funding to do this analysis, it would not have been possible without the many contributed hours of our principal investigator, Dr. Mary Sparks, and our project coordinator and editor, Anne Markowitch. The hours of research and writing went well beyond our funds. In addition, substantial in-kind contributions were made by Hull House Association.

For their financial support of this project, we are grateful to the Chicago Department of Human Services and to the Joyce Foundation.

One of the significant challenges of our analysis was to track down the data. We are pleased, impressed, and grateful to the many state agency administrators whom we pestered for data. They were patient, obliging, and helpful. Special thanks are due to Tom Berkshire, Assistant to the Governor, without whom we could not have acquired the data necessary for this study.

Lastly, I wish to thank the members of our project advisory committee for their interest, time, insight, and support:

Shirley Buttrick, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Chicago
Barbara Flynn Currie, State Representative
Elizabeth Hershey, Department of Human Services
Kappy Laing, Mayor's Office of Legislative Liaison
Mary Ann Miskiewicz, Budget Office, City of Chicago
Michael A. O Connor, Illinois State Support Center
Judith Walker, Department of Human Services
Betty Willhoite, League of Women Voters of Chicago

The idea for this project came out of my service for the last three years on the Advisory Committee for Block Grants. I have listened to hours and hours of testimony from both state agency administrators and citizens. The citizens' testimony often centered on issues of need and equity and, therefore, my own concern has centered on the severity of the needs and the equity of the state's distribution of resources.

It seemed almost impossible to get any kind of handle on this issue of equity, but that is precisely what has been done through this analysis. We owe our thanks for this to Dr. Mary Sparks, who brought unusual insight, analytical ability, skill, and commitment to this study.

It is hoped that this analysis will be useful to policy makers in both the executive and the legislative branches of state government. There is already in place an Advisory Committee on Block Grants (P.A. 82-904), created in 1982 by the State Legislature. This Advisory Committee, as part of the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, is empowered to conduct public hearings on the intended uses of block grant funds, to monitor the use of block grants, and to make recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Governor concerning funding levels for block grants. This Advisory Committee is strategically situated to act upon the problems identified and the recommendations made in this report.

The Research and Advocacy Department of Hull House has produced many reports over the past four years. They are aimed at helping us, as citizens, to develop equitable and compassionate public policies. The only "special interest" involved is justice. Therefore, this report is dedicated to the many public spirited citizens of the State of Illinois.

Ann Seng, Director
Research and Advocacy Department
Hull House Association

HYPOTHESIS

In 1981, the United States Congress established nine block grants to state and local governments through the enactment of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act. Over thirty-five categorical programs were folded into the nine block grants, accompanied by a significant decrease in the total dollars granted to the states.

This same legislation required that the states prepare reports on the proposed use of block grant funds. The reports, among other things, should include

> the criteria and methods established for the distribution of funds, including details on how the distribution of funds will be targeted on the basis of need to achieve the purpose of the block grant funds.

This federal requirement is the starting point for our analysis and report. Our central hypothesis is that, as a result of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, specifically its Block Grant provisions to the states, the State of Illinois has distributed a smaller proportion of its federal block grant funds to those counties with the highest proportion of the State's poverty population as compared to the proportional distribution of those federal dollars under the categorical programs.

Federal block grant money comes to Illinois through nine block grants. Because of limitations of time and applicability, only six of these block grants have been studied:

1. Home Energy Assistance
2. Community Services
3. Maternal and Child Health
4. Preventive Health and Health Services
5. Mental Health and Drug Abuse
6. Title XX - Social Services.

METHODOLOGY

Since the intention of this study is to track federal dollars as they impact on the poor population of this state, it seemed logical to use a geographical base. Figures for the number of poor in the state are easily available on the county level. It was logical, therefore, to use the county as the geographical unit.

From the number of poor in each county (See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984), it was possible to identify counties with the largest concentrations of poor people in two different ways:

1. Statewide, the proportion of Illinois poor people living in each county.

2. Countywide, the percentage of poor people within each county.

The fifteen counties in 1982 with the highest proportions of poor people within the state are:

	Number	Proportion of State
1. Cook	705,684	.57348
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780
3. Madison	23,895	.01942
4. Lake	21,884	.01778
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672
6. Will	20,317	.01651
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520
10. Kane	16,718	.01359
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107
13. Macon	12,803	.01040
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989

The fifteen counties with highest percentages of county population in poverty in 1982 are:

	Number	Percentage of County
1. Pulaski	2,614	29.6
2. Alexander	3,217	26.2
3. Pope	881	20.0
4. Jackson	12,168	19.8
5. Hardin	1,025	19.0
6. Gallatin	1,347	17.7
7. St.Clair	46,511	17.4
8. Greene	2,879	17.3
9. Brown	872	16.1
10. Hamilton	1,465	16.0

	Number	Percentage of County
12. Massac	2,268	15.1
13. Johnson	1,434	14.9
14. Saline	4,171	14.6
15. Clay	2,188	14.3

Combining the two groups of counties, this study encompasses 28 counties, since two counties, St. Clair and Jackson Counties, fall into both types of counties.

For each of the grants studied, there are two tables for each of the above types of counties: 1. the poverty population in each county as a proportion of the total state poverty population; and 2. the poverty population as a percentage of the total population of the county. In each of the grant tables, 1 through 30, the first three columns of figures provide, for each county studied, the total number of persons in poverty, the county's proportion of the state's poverty population, and the percentage of each county's population which is poor.

Though half of the counties in this study were selected because of their high percentages for intra-county poverty, the analysis of equitable distribution is based on each county's proportion of the state's poverty population. Each table also presents data on federal dollars received by each county under both categorical and block grant systems, thereby enabling the analyst to compare a county's proportion of poor people to its proportion of federal dollars received by the state in the form of categorical or block grants.

DATA COLLECTION

For each grant, the administering department or agency within the state was approached for appropriate data. Since this is a comparison of federal dollars provided through categorical funding and federal dollars provided through block grants, we requested figures from categorical grant years 1980 or 1981 and block grant figures from 1983 or 1984. The years of comparison are indicated on each table.

Since departments are not required to collect and store data in any uniform way, it was sometimes difficult for the department to provide us with data that were applicable. All departments, however, were most cooperative in providing as much information as could be gathered.

Limitations of data and lack of uniformity in reporting will be dealt with later in this study.

THE "FAIR SHARE" CONCEPT

The "fair share" concept in this study uses one measure of equity in the distribution of federal funds to selected counties in the State of Illinois. This measure is the correspondence between the county's proportion of the state's poverty population and the proportion of funds which the county received from the total funds allocated to Illinois by the federal government. Since some funds were retained centrally and not distributed, in some cases the term "total funds" refers, not to the total amount received by the state, but to that amount designated for distribution to agencies and organizations throughout the state.

Undoubtedly, there are other variables which we could have used to measure "fair share," e.g., distribution on the basis of a per capita formula. However, because of limited resources, this variable and several other significant variables pertinent to the concept and discussion of "fair share" are not addressed in this study.

The concept of a "fair share" and its use as a criterion in policy decisions are complex problems. This study proposes that such complexities are initially unraveled by organizing and presenting data in terms of some criterion pertinent to the issue of equity, a criterion such as poverty. Whether or not a criterion such as poverty should determine the allocation or distribution of public funds is a matter for public reflection and debate.

In order to evaluate how the counties with the highest concentration of poor fared from federal grants to Illinois, the following system was devised: Using 1. a county's proportion of the state's poverty population* and 2. the proportion of federal funds the county's public or private agencies received

a. a county received <u>less</u> than its fair share if it received either nothing or a difference of -.005 or more between a county's proportion of poor and its proportion of federal funds.

b. a county received <u>more</u> than its fair share if there was a difference of +.005 or more between a county's proportion of poor and its proportion of federal funds.

c. a county received an allocation in the fair share range if the difference between a county's fair share of federal funds and the proportion of such funds it actually received was not + or - .005 or more than its proportion for poverty.

* Proportions of state poverty were too small in 13 of the counties with highest percentages of county population in poverty to be analyzed using the above measure of fair share. Nonetheless, because all but one of these counties received less than their fair share in both categorical and block grant years, they are presented for the reader's consideration throughout the study. See page 12.

MAJOR FINDINGS

This study compares federal dollars coming to the State of Illinois through categorical grants in either 1980 or 1981 with federal dollars coming to the State of Illinois for equivalent programs through block grants in 1983 or 1984. It tracks these federal dollars as they relate to counties with the highest proportion of poor within the state or the largest percentage of poor within the counties studied.

Based on data received for both categorical and block grant years for the six grant programs studied, we are able to present the following findings:

1. Though the 28 counties in this study account for 80.6% of the Illinois poverty population, they received only 66.9% of the federal funds allocated to the state under the block grant system, compared to 69.8% under the federal categorical system.

   While these counties as a group did not receive a fair share of the federal money coming into the state under either type of grant system, these counties fared worse under the block grant system. As a group, they lost 10.8% of their fair share of federal funds under the categorical system, compared to 13.7% under the block grant system.

   Proportionately, under the block grant system, their condition deteriorated by -.029 (or 2.9%). By the definition used in this study, this was a considerable loss, amounting to almost $6 million lost in the years studied. As a group, the 28 counties studied received proportionately less federal money under the block grant system of distribution than they had received for comparable federal categorical programs. For the six grant programs studied, the estimated dollars lost under the categorical grant system were approximately $9,710,803, while under the block grant system, they totaled $15,667,247.

2. Overall, from 1980 to 1984, there were no significant advances toward a fair share for the 15 counties with the largest proportion of Illinois' poor. Four counties received considerably less than their fair share under both categorical and block grant systems of distribution:

Champaign	Madison
Cook	St. Clair

   Nine counties were in a fair share range under both categorical and block grant systems of distribution:

Jackson	Peoria
Kane	Rock Island
Kankakee	Winnebago
Lake	Will
Macon	

One county which had not been in a fair share range under the categorical grant system moved into the fair share range under the block grant system: DuPage.

No county received considerably more than its fair share of the total for the six grants, if Sangamon County is excluded because of problematic data.

3. While most of the counties studied fall into the fair share range, some received more than their fair share while others received less. One must keep in mind that even a proportion of +.001 more than a county's fair share or -.001 less than a county's fair share amounts to a considerable amount of money. For example, under the block grant system, the following counties, though in a fair share range, received more than their fair share of federal funds:

   Lake County - - - (+.001) equals $186,262 more than its fair share
   Jackson County- - (+.002) equals $277,675 more than its fair share
   Kane County - - - (+.004) equals $546,885 more than its fair share.

   Likewise, under the block grant system, the following counties, though in a fair share range, received less than their fair share of federal funds:

   Macon County - - (-.001) equals $93,674 less than its fair share
   Kankakee County - (-.002) equals $221,706 less than its fair share
   Will County - - - (-.004) equals $376,398 less than its fair share.

4. With regard to the two counties having the highest proportions of Illinois poverty population (Cook and St. Clair), Cook County fared worst by far. In the categorical grant years, it received .510 of its fair share, compared to .455 under the block grant system: a negative difference of -.055 or 5.5%.

   St. Clair, on the other hand, improved its proportion of federal funds received from .013 in the categorical grant years to .023 in the block grant years: a positive difference of +.010 or 1.0%. Nevertheless, in the block grant year, St. Clair County lost $1,551,681 of the amount which should have been its fair share.

   Cook County, under the block grant system, lost $13,395,024 of its fair share. If Cook County had received, under the block grant system, the proportional share it received under the categorical system (.510), it would have received approximately $6,289,771 more for these six grants than it received under the block grant system. Instead of a loss of $13,395,024, its loss would have been $7,105,253.

   There is no doubt that, because of Cook County's high proportion of poverty, it has the most to lose. And in the past five years, it has, indeed, been losing the most.

SUMMARY COMPARISON: SIX BLOCK GRANTS FINDINGS
(Excluding Drug Abuse)

Categorical System		Block Grant System	

1. Of the 15 counties with the highest proportions of Illinois poverty population, the following counties received considerably less than their fair share of federal funds (a difference of -.005 or more between a county's proportion of the state's poverty population and the proportion of federal funds it received:

Cook	Madison	Cook	Madison
Champaign	St. Clair	Champaign	St. Clair
DuPage			

Of the 13 counties with the highest percentage of the county residents living in poverty, the following counties received only half or less than half of their fair share (Fair share range from .002 to .0007)

Alexander	Pike	Alexander	Greene
Greene	Pope	Brown	Pike
Hamilton	Pulaski		
Hardin			

2. In terms of dollars, 17 of the 28 counties studied received less than their fair share, but all of them were in the fair share range (i.e., the difference between a county's fair share of federal funds and the proportion of such funds it actually received was not -.005 or more than the proportion of poverty):

Alexander:	- $ 69,113	Alexander:	- $ 84,953
Brown:	- 26,533	Brown:	- 38,729
Clay:	- 20,418	Clay:	- 40,841
Gallatin:	- 34,557	Gallatin:	- 42,476
Greene:	- 74,672	Greene:	- 84,152
Hamilton:	- 37,337	Hamilton:	- 42,476
Hardin:	- 28,100	Hardin:	- 20,464
Johnson:	- 34,557	Johnson:	- 42,476
Lake:	- 160,490	Kankakee:	- 221,706
Kane:	- 157,949	Macon:	- 93,674
Pike:	- 106,281	Massac:	- 42,476
Pope:	- 37,198	Pike:	- 110,471
Pulaski:	- 69,113	Pope:	- 29,734
Rock Island:	- 212,524	Rock Island:	- 35,703
Saline:	- 49,623	Saline:	- 76,738
Will:	- 355,470	Will:	- 376,398
Winnebago:	- 192,125	Winnebago:	- 200,311

Categorical System

3. In terms of dollars, Cook and St. Clair, the two counties with the highest proportion of Illinois poor people, lost the most:

Cook:	- $5,595,110
St. Clair:	- 2,069,643

4. Other counties receiving considerably less than their fair share also lost large amounts of federal funds:

Champaign:	- $534,785
DuPage:	- 672,061
Madison:	- 658,404

Block Grant System

3. In terms of dollars, Cook and St. Clair Counties lost the most:

Cook:	- $13,395,024
St. Clair:	- 1,551,681

4. Other counties receiving considerably less than their fair share also lost large amounts of federal funds:

Champaign:	- $573,659
Madison:	- 525,320

PROBLEMS OF DATA GATHERING

In order to address the policy issue of fairness/equitability in the allocation of federal funds for categorical and block grant programs to counties within the state, special requests were made to those departments primarily responsible for administering these programs: the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA), the Illinois Department of Public Aid (DPA), and the Illinois Department of Public Health (DPH). In addition, because many state departments participate with DPA in the administration of the Social Services Block Grant (Title XX), DPA requested the cooperation of the following allied agencies:

1. Illinois Department of Aging (DOA)
2. Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse (DASA)
3. Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)
4. Illinois Department of Corrections (DOC)
5. Illinois Department of Mental Health (DMH)
6. Illinois Department of Public Health (DPH)
7. Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services (DORS)
8. Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)

Though we were impressed with and grateful for the significant cooperation of all the state agencies and departments from whom we asked for information, it is nevertheless, necessary to point out that there have been some serious problems in the process of gathering data for this report.

1. Total dollars presented here are based on data provided. It is evident that we did not receive totals for all departments. For example, the Energy Assistance Program: There are three administering segments for this program: 1) local administering agencies; 2) the Public Housing Authority; and 3) the Department of Public Aid. We were provided with 1983 expenditures for counties only for those grants allocated to local administering agencies. In FFY 83, grants to those agencies accounted for 49.3% of the total block grant for this fund. How the remainder was distributed to counties through the Public Housing Authority and the Department of Public Aid is unknown.

2. No data were provided for FFY 81 drug abuse programs; therefore, there is no basis for comparison.

3. Administrative costs for Maternal and Child Health are reported as 0. This hardly seems likely.

4. For at least one grant, Maternal and Child Health, a large portion of the total grant money was spent on research (33% of the grant in FFY 81 and 30% of the total in FFY 84) and special projects sponsored

by the Department of Public Health (18% in FFY 81 and 28% in FFY 84.) These special projects include such programs as family planning, immunization, lead paint poisoning, genetic screening. All of these are worthwhile and necessary, but it is impossible from the data received to judge them in relation to the poverty population in each county.

5. A common problem, which requires something like an accounting juggling act, is the problem of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) and State Fiscal Year (SFY). For example, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant Application for 1985 reported data for FFY 84. However, data sent by the Department of Mental Health on providers of mental health services reported data for SFY 84. Since the State Fiscal Year begins on July 1 and the Federal Fiscal Year begins on October 1, the data on grants to providers do not correspond with data presented in the annual report.

6. Throughout this study, there is reference made to agencies serving more than one county. This is a perfectly understandable situation. It does, however, skew the data for any analysis by county.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The state is responsible to the public for the expenditure of public money. It is, therefore, necessary for the state to report that expenditure in such a way that the public can understand where and how the money is used.

Recognizing that each state administering agency and department has its own characteristics and must deal with factors that are distinct from other agencies and departments, nevertheless, we suggest that there be some minimal statewide standardization of data.

Certainly, data on all grant components administered by a department should be reported by means of uniform accounting procedures, including a method for comparing the effectiveness of one component with another.

Minimal statewide standardization of data should include the following requirements for all departments and public or private agencies providing services funded with public money:

a. Consistent use of Federal Fiscal Year or State Fiscal Year.
b. Presentation of data by some standard geographic unit. Since U.S. census data and poverty populations are broken out by county, the county seems a natural geographic unit.
c. Presentation of data by income level of recipients/clients.

PROBLEM OF CRITERIA FOR FUND DISTRIBUTION

This study developed a "fair share" construct based on the proportion of poor in the state and the percentage of poor in each county. It suggests that federal funds be used where they are most needed, for the poor.

Any uniform method of reporting must reflect the underlying administrative policy for the distribution of funds. For certain types of grants, consideration of where the poor are located does not appear to be a determining factor. At least, the inability of certain departments to report data in this manner indicates that such is the case, since statistics on poverty are gathered and presented according to counties, while statistics on expenditures or grants are not. It is, for example, ironic that, though the Illinois Department of Public Aid included data on a needs assessment organized according to its eight planning regions in the state, data presented on program expenditures are for the state as a whole. Moreover, the Illinois Department of Public Aid's Comprehensive Annual Services Plan: Title XX does not even report statistics on poverty and low income for the state as a whole or according to regions or counties.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend, therefore, that

a. The state develop clear criteria for expenditure of federal funds, including criteria based on the incidence of poverty in geographic areas throughout the state.

b. Each agency and department develop its own criteria, based on the overall criteria of the state administration.

c. All methods of reporting be designed to reflect how those criteria guide the programs of each agency and department.

PROPORTIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS STUDIED* - CUMULATIVE

County	Proportion of Poor	Categorical (1980/81) Total = $99,914,845 Proportion of Total Received	Difference	Block (1983/1984) Total = $114,359,645 Proportion of Total Received	Difference
Cook	.573	.510 **	(-.063)	.455 **	(-.118)
St. Clair	.037	.013 **	(-.024)	.023 **	(-.014)
Madison	.019	.011 **	(-.008)	.014 **	(-.005)
Lake	.017	.015 **	(-.002	.018 **	(+.001)
Winnebago	.016	.013	(-.003)	.014	(-.002)
Will	.016	.012 **	(-.004)	.012 **	(-.004)
DuPage	.016	.008	(-.008)	.016	---
Champaign	.015	.009	(-.006)	.009	(-.006)
Peoria	.015	.018	(+.003	.019	(+.004)
Kane	.013	.011	(-.002)	.017	(+.004)
Sangamon	.012	.027 ***	(+.015)	.024 ***	(+.012)
Rock Island	.011	.008	(-.003)	.010	(-.001)
Macon	.010	.011	(+.001)	.009	(-.001)
Kankakee	.009	.011	(+.002)	.007	(-.002)
Jackson	.009	.011	(+.002)	.011	(+.002)
Pulaski	.002	.001 **	(-.001)	.002 **	---
Alexander	.002	.001 **	(-.001)	.001 **	(-.001)
Pope	.0007	.0002	(-.0005)	.0004 **	(-.0003)
Hardin	.008	.0004	(-.004)	.0006 **	(-.0002)
Gallatin	.001	.0006 **	(-.0004)	.0006 **	(-.0004)
Greene	.002	.001 **	(-.001)	.001	(-.001)
Brown	.0007	.0004	(-.0003)	.0003	(-.0004)
Hamilton	.001	.0005 **	(-.0005)	.0006	(-.0004)
Pike .	.002	.0008	(-.0012)	.001	(-.001)
Massac	.001	.001 **	---	.0006 **	(-.0004)
Johnson	.001	.0006 **	(-.0004)	.0006 **	(-.004)
Saline	.003	.002 **	(-.001)	.002 **	(-.001)
Clay	.001	.0007 **	(-.003)	.0006	(-.0004)

* The grant program for drug abuse is excluded. All counties in the study are included. For individual grants, the amount of money reported as more (+) or less (-) than a county's fair share was calculated by the following method:

1. Each county's fair share was calculated for individual grants by multiplying the total amount of money allocated to the program times a county's proportion of the state's poor people, using the first 3 decimal places of the figure reported. Dollar amounts were rounded to the nearest dollar.

2. How much more or less than its fair share a county received for each grant was calculated by substracting the amount received from the county's fair share (for "less than fair share") or its fair share from the amount received (for "more than fair share").

3. To derive the proportion of grant dollars a county received, the total amount of money (more or less than its fair share) was added to or substracted from a county's fair share of the grand total and then divided by the grand total. The difference (+ or -) between a county's proportion of poor people and the proportion of federal grant money it received is the proportion (+ or -) reported here. Proportions are reported in three decimal places. None have been rounded.

** This figure excluded consideration of grants to agencies serving this county and one or more other counties.

*** This figure includes a grant to an agency which distributed funds throughout the state. See Table 13.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TOTAL DOLLARS GAINED OR LOST FOR SIX GRANT PROGRAM *

Categorical (1980/1981) Total = $89,914,845			Block (1983/1984) Total = $114,359,465		
Cook	-	5,595,110 **	Cook	-	13,395,024 **
St. Clair	-	2,069,643 **	St. Clair	-	1,551,681 **
Madison	-	658,404 **	Madison	-	525,320 **
Lake	-	160,490 **	Lake	+	186,262 **
Winnebago	-	192,125	Winnebago	-	200,311
Will	-	355,470 **	Will	-	376,398 **
DuPage	-	672,061	DuPage	+	68,226
Champaign	-	534,785	Champaign	-	573,659
Peoria	+	323,513	Peoria	+	560,407
Kane	-	157,949	Kane	+	546,885
Sangamon	+	1,365,119 ***	Sangamon	+	1,377,942 ***
Rock Island	-	212,524	Rock Island	-	35,703
Macon	+	118,379	Macon	-	93,674
Kankakee	+	183,664	Kankakee	-	221,706
Jackson	+	237,966	Jackson	+	277,675
Pulaski	-	69,113 **	Pulaski	+	7,404 **
Alexander	-	69,113 **	Alexander	-	84,953 **
Pope	-	37,198	Pope	-	29,734 **
Hardin	-	28,100	Hardin	-	20,464 **
Gallatin	-	34,557 **	Gallatin	-	42,476 **
Greene	-	74,672 **	Greene	-	84,152
Brown	-	26,533	Brown	-	38,729
Hamilton	-	37,337 **	Hamilton	-	42,476
Pike	-	106,281	Piek	-	110,471
Massac	+	28,108 **	Massac	-	42,476 **
Johnson	-	34,557 **	Johnson	-	42,476 **
Saline	-	49,623 **	Saline	-	76,738 **
Clay	-	20,418 **	Clay	-	40,841

* The grant program for drug abuse is excluded. All counties in the study are included. For individual grants, the amount of money reported as more (+) or less (-) than a county's fair share was calculated by the following method:

1. Each county's fair share was calculated for individual grants by multiplying the total amount of money allocated to the program times a county's proportion of the state's poor people, using the first 3 decimal places of the figure reported. Dollar amounts were rounded to the nearest dollar.
2. How much more or less than its fair share a county received for each grant was calculated by substracting the amount received from the county's fair share (for "less than fair share") or its fair share from the amount received (for "more than fair share").
3. To derive the proportion of grant dollars a county received, the total amount of money (more or less than its fair share) was added to or substracted from a county's fair share of the grand total and then divided by the grand total. The difference (+ or -) between a county's proportion of poor people and the proportion of federal grant money it received is the proportion (+ or -) reported here. Proportions are reported in three decimal places. None have been rounded.

** This figure excluded consideration of grants to agencies serving this county and one or more other counties.

*** This figure includes a grant to an agency which distributed funds throughout the state. See Table 13.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAJOR CITIES WITHIN THE COUNTIES STUDIED

The poor are not evenly distributed throughout the state. The vast majority of Illinois' poor live in urban areas. Though we did not study the proportion of federal money going to cities, it is important to note that the majority of Illinois' cities (large or small) are located in the fifteen counties with the highest proportions of the state's poverty population.

If we infer that these cities received shares comparable to those of the counties in which they are located, it would appear that not all cities in the state fared equitably or received a fair share of federal funds for these programs. At the same time, it is also quite possible that some cities may have benefited proportionately more or less than other cities located in the same county.

The cities cited here range in size from over 3 million (Chicago) to approximately 27,000 (Carbondale).

A. Cities Located in Counties Which Received Considerably Less Than Their Fair Share of Federal Funds for Six Programs.

Categorical Grants	Block Grants
Champaign County (-.006):	Champaign County (-.006):
Champaign	Champaign
Urbana	Urbana
Cook County (-.063):	Cook County (-.118):
Chicago	Chicago
Evanston	Evanston
Arlington Heights	Arlington Heights
Oak Lawn	Oak Lawn
Oak Park	Oak Park
DuPage County (-.008):	
Wheaton	
Madison County (-.008):	Madison (-.005):
Alton	Alton
St. Clair County (-.024):	St. Clair County (-.014):
East St. Louis	East St. Louis
Belleville	Belleville

B. Cities Located in Counties Which Received Grants in a Fair Share Range for Six Programs.

Categorical Grants	Block Grants
	DuPage County (Fair Share) Wheaton
Jackson County (+.002): * Carbondale	Jackson County (+.002): * Carbondale
Kane County (-.002)" ** Aurora Elgin	Kane County (+.004): Aurora Elgin
Kankakee County (+.002): * Kankakee	Kankakee County (-.002): ** Kankakee
Lake County (-.002): ** Waukegan North Chicago	Lake County (+.001): * Waukegan North Chicago
Macon County (+.001): * Decatur	Macon County (-.001): ** Decatur
Peoria County (+.003): * Peoria	Peoria County (+.004): * Peoria
Rock Island County (-.003): ** Rock Island Moline	Rock Island County (-.001): ** Rock Island Moline
Will County (-.004): ** Joliet	Will County (-.004): * Joliet
Winnebago County (-.003): ** Rockford	Winnebago County (-.002): ** Rockford

C. Cities Located in Counties Which Received Considerably More Than Their Fair Share of Federal Funds for Six Programs

Categorical Grants	Block Grants
None ***	None ***

* County is in fair share range but received more than a fair share in funds.
** County is in fair share range but received less than a fair share in funds.
*** Though Sangamon County appears to have received considerably more than its fair share under both categorical grants (+.015) and block grants (+.012), this is due to a grant for over $1 million to an agency which distributed funds to various service centers throughout the state. Since, however, it is not known how much of this amoutn remained in Sangamon County, the county's status with regard to fair share cannot be determined. The city of Springfield is in Sangamon County.

HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

TABLE 1

Federal Grants to Illinois for Home Energy Assistance Programs by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty (Grants to Local Administering Agencies) Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $33,994,663**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $56,388,999**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	13,667,329	.402	23,808,365	.422
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	1,487,666	.026
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	797,855	.023	1,126,173	.020
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	619,911	.018	1,134,175	.020
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	***	***	1,102,374	.020
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	****	****	999,846	.018
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	*****	*****	834,816	.015
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	459,693	.014	716,058	.013
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	857,280	.025	920,039	.016
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	*****	*****	770,221	.014
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	******	******	741,139	.013
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	*******	*******	755,809	.013
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	395,550	.012	599,168	.011
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	545,384	.016	547,212	.010
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	********	********	472,277	.008

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** This total is the total amount allocated to local administering agencies; it is not the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois by the federal government for energy assistance programs. The federal allocation for FFY 81 was $101,000,000. For FFY 83, the block grant allocation was $114,400,000.

*** This county was one of the two counties served by an agency which was awarded $733,955 (.022) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

**** This county was one of two counties served by an agency which was awarded $901,569 (.027) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

***** This county was one of three counties served by an agency which was awarded $1,402,472 (.041) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

****** This county was one of two counties served by an agency which was awarded $620,051 (.018) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

******* This county was one of three counties served by an agency which was awarded $830,299 (.024) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

******** This county was one of four counties served by an agency which was awarded $680,631 (.020) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

TABLE 2

Federal Grants to Illinois for Home Energy Assistance Programs by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty.
(Grants to Local Administering Agencies.)
Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $33,994,663**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $56,388,939**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	***	***	132,327	.002
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	***	***	169,616	.003
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	***	***	58,213	.001
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	****	****	472,277	.008
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	***	***	66,881	.001
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	*****	*****	74,447	.001
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	1,487,666	.026
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	******	******	135,149	.002
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	*******	*******	51,545	.001
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	*****	*****	88,936	.002
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	*******	*******	146,946	.003
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	***	***	143,406	.003
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	***	***	82,422	.001
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	*****	*****	274,350	.005
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	********	********	116,120	.002

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** This total is the total amount allocated to local administering agencies; it is not the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois by the federal government for energy assistance programs. The federal allocation for FFY 81 was $101,000,000. For FFY 83, the block grant allocation was $114,400,000.

*** This county was one of seven counties served by an agency which was awarded $911,334 (.027) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

**** This county was one of four counties served by an agency which was awarded $680,631 (.20) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

***** This county was one of seven counties served by an agency which was awarded $922,949 (.027) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

****** This county was one of four counties served by an agency which was awarded $616,488 (.018) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

******* This county was one of four counties served by an agency which was awarded $693,482 (.02) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

******** This county was one of seven counties served by an agency which was awarded $1,115,379 (.033) of the total allocated for FFY 81.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Energy Assistance - Tables 1 and 2
(Component Administered by Local Administrative Agency)

FFY 81 Total = $33,994,663

Cook	-	5,811,613
St. Clair	-	1,257,803
Peoria	+	347,360
Kankakee	+	239,432

FFY 83 Total = $56,388,999

Cook	-	8,502,531
St. Clair	-	598,727

HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

While the vast majority of counties appear to be in the fair share range for FFY 81* (a categorical grant year) and FFY 83 (a block grant year), it is obvious that Cook and St. Clair Counties received considerably less than their fair shares for that component of the Home Energy Assistance Program administered by local administering agencies.

Indeed, even in the better of the two years, Cook County lost 15% of its fair share. In FFY 83, it received only 42%, compared to 57% (its percentage of Illinois' poverty population). Likewise, though St. Clair County's percentage increased from 0% in FFY 81 to 2.6% in FFY 83, it too lagged behind its fair share of 3.7% by 1.1 percentage points.

In terms of dollars, Cook County lost $5,811,613 in FFY 81 and $8,502,531 in FFY 83. St. Clair lost $1,257,803 in FFY 81 and $598,727 in FFY 83.

Though Peoria and Kankakee Counties received considerably more than their fair shares in FFY 81 ($347,360 and $239,432 respectively), they were in the fair share range for FFY 83.

Several counties not included in this study (and perhaps some in this study as well*) must account for the $9 million which Cook and St. Clair Counties lost in FFY 83, since the total for each year is the total of funds actually awarded to local administering agencies. Though none of the 28 counties in this study received considerably more (+.005) than its fair share of energy assistance funds under this component of the program in FFY 83, 15 of the counties studied did receive more.

It may well be that a comprehensive study of Illinois' 102 counties would reveal that the large loss of funds to the two counties with the highest proportion of Illinois' poor people resulted in comparatively small gains for many counties in the state. On the other hand, since 74 counties were not studied, it may well be that some or many of these counties received considerably more than their fair share.

Though this grant program does consider the needs of poor people, its guidelines for income are based on 125% of the Office of Management and Budget Poverty Guidelines and 150% of the AFDC Standard of Need. This creates a more competitive situation for funds.

* Since for FFY 81, there were so many counties (other than those involved in the study) which were also served by local administering agencies serving those counties in the study, and since no breakdowns by county were provided, we did not attempt to analyze those counties represented by agencies serving more than one county.

PROBLEMS SPECIFIC TO THE HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE GRANT

Although D.C.C.A. is charged with the overall administration of this program, it shares this responsibility with 1) local administering agencies, 2) Public Housing Authorities, and 3) D.P.A. Unfortunately, because FFY 83 expenditure data for counties were not provided for the latter two administrative components, this study is able to compare and report on only those energy assistance grants allocated to local administering agencies.

In FFY 81, grants allocated to these local agencies accounted for 33.7 percent of the entire categorical grant. In FFY 83, grants to such agencies accounted for 49.3 percent of the total block grant funds available for this program. How the remainder of the total funds for FFY 83 was distributed to counties through Public Housing Authorities and D.P.A. is unknown.

More is known about FFY 81. In an interim report prepared by D.C.C.A. for FFY 81, $82,552,537 or 81.7 percent of the total categorical funds for this program were obligated to the counties for various program components and a breakdown by counties was provided. The 1983 report gave no such breakdown.

Given these limitations of data on the energy assistance program in Illinois, conclusions must remain tentative. While data on local administering agencies provide one measure of fairness or equity, the absence of data on other measures for FFY 83 (payments to Public Housing Authorities and D.P.A.) impose serious limitations on final conclusions with regard to this program as a whole.

An indicator of the serious limitation which partial data for a program impose on conclusions is the fact that for FFY 81 (a year in which D.C.C.A. reported funds obligated to Illinois counties for all components of the Energy Assistance Program), the total funds obligated to Cook County were $51,439,786 or 62 percent of all funds ($82,552,537) obligated to Illinois counties for that year.

When all components of this categorical grant are considered, and if this interim report on obligated funds approximates actual expenditures, Cook County received considerably more (+.050) than its fair share (.573), though it received considerably less (-.171) for that program component administered by local administering agencies. Obligated funds to St. Clair County, on the other hand, totaled $2,406,854, an amount considerably less (-.008) than its fair share for all program components in FFY 81. The two other counties (Kankakee and Peoria) which received considerably more than their fair share through the one program component in FFY 81 maintained some advantage when all program components were included: Kankakee (+.002) and Peoria (+.001) (Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. LIEAP: The Interim Report of the Low Income Energy Assistance Program/ 1980-81.)

How these and other counties in this study fared for all components of the Energy Assistance Program in FFY 83, when it was administered as part of the federal government's block grant program, is unknown, since comparable fiscal data for counties were not reported to the public nor provided to us, the researchers.

Another problem with this grant is the provision that up to 10% of the overall funds for this program can be transferred to the Community Services, Social Services, or health-related block grants.

This provision has resulted in some controversy. In its plan for FFY 84, DCCA proposed transferring "up to ten percent of the energy assistance funds into the Community Services Block Grant." Its rationale for this decision was "to carry out the Department's objective of alleviating poverty." (Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, 1984 Plan, 5)

This proposal met with some resistance. In testimony at a public hearing, it was alleged that the money transferred to the Community Services Block Grant in 1983 would be used "to subsidize loans to small businesses in the hope of stimulating jobs in Illinois," while, at the same time, as of September 1, 1983, there were 39,173 households which had been disconnected by the major utility companies in the state.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

TABLE 3

Federal Grants to Illinois for Community Services by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $18,584,000**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $13,216,818**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	13,826,000	.744	8,725,257	.660
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	853,000	.046	485,229	.037
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	207,000	.011	309,773	.023
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	188,000	.010	296,464	.022
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	197,000	.011	273,005	.021
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	209,000	.011	252,417	.019
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	-	-	-	-
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	260,000	.014	238,542	.018
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	158,000	.009	169,181	.013
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	163,000	.009	166,092	.013
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	***	***	160,337	.012
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	162,000	.009	152,475	.012
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	226,000	.012	134,992	.010
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** This total is the total amount allocated to community action agencies; it is not the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois by the federal government for community services. The federal allocation for FFY 81 was $18,584,000. For FFY 82, the block grant allocation was $15,551.24.

*** This county was one of three counties served by a community action agency which was awarded $181,000 (.010) of the total allocated to community action agencies for FFY 81.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY SERVICES

TABLE 4

Federal Grants to Illinois for Community Services by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty.

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $18,584,000**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $13,216,818**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	***	***	118,791	.009
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	***	***	35,445	.003
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	9,777	.001
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	11,272	.001
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	****	****	14,830	.001
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	853,000	.046	485,229	.037
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	*****	*****	31,778	.002
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	****	****	16,161	.001
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	***	***	24,988	.002
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	***	***	15,889	.001
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	****	****	46,038	.003
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	******	******	24,173	.002

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** This total is the total amount allocated to Community Action Agencies; it is not the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois by the federal government for community services. The federal allocation for FFY 81 was $18,584,000. For FFY 83, the block grant allocation was $15,551,241.

*** This county was one of five counties served by a community action agency which was awarded $225,000 (.012) of the total allocated to community action agencies for FFY 81.

**** This county was one of seven counties served by a community action agency which was awarded $184,500 (.010) of the total allocated to community action agencies for FFY 81.

***** This county was one of four counties served by a community action agency which was awarded $150,000 (.008) of the total allocated to community action agencies for FFY 81.

****** This county was one of seven counties served by a community action agency which was awarded $239,000 (.013) of the total allocated to community action agencies for FFY 81.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Community Services - Tables 3 and 4

FFY 81 Total = $18,584,000			FFY 83 Total = $13,216,818		
Cook	+	3,177,368	Cook	+	1,152,020
St. Clair	+	165,392			
Madison	-	146,096			
Lake	-	127,928	Lake	+	71,778
Winnebago	-	100,344	Winnebago	+	61,536
Will	-	88,344			
DuPage	-	297,344	DePage	-	211,469
Champaign	-	287,760	Champaign	-	198,252
Rock Island	-	116,344 *			
Jackson	-	167,256	Jackson	-	118,951
Pope	-	13,009			
Hardin	-	14,867			
Brown	-	13,009		-	9,252
Pike	-	37,168		-	26,434
Pulaski	-		Pulaski	+	92,356

* Includes Henry and Mercer Counties which, along with Rock Island County, were served by one Community Action Agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY SERVICES

> The purpose of Community Services Block Grant is to provide services and activities which will have a measurable and possibly major impact on causes of poverty in a community or in areas where poverty is a particularly acute problem. ...Reflecting its position within the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the Illinois Community Services Block Grant Program has as its highest priority programs which stimulate economic development. (Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Illinois Community Services Block Grant - 1984 Application, 28)

Basic grants for this program are allocated to local community action agencies on the basis of the following formula: 90% of CSBG funds are allocated to community action agencies. "Ninety percent of this allocation (90%) were based on the grantee's jurisdictional share of the state's poverty population." (DCCA, 1984 Application, 30)

Under the categorical grant system of FFY 81, seven of the 28 counties studied received no categorical grant at all, and five received considerably less than their fair shares.

Cook and St. Clair Counties, on the other hand, were the only counties to receive considerably more than their fair shares. (It should be noted that this was the only grant program under which Cook County received more than its fair share, and only one of two for St. Clair County.)

Though in the block grant program of FFY 83 Cook County lost some of this advantage, it still received considerably more (66% compared to its fair share of 57%). In terms of dollars, this translated into $1,152,020 more than its fair share for FFY 83. However, when this figure is compared to the amount in excess of Cook County's fair share for FFY 81 ($3,177,368), the difference between the two federal fiscal years is $2,025,348 less in excess funds. This, combined with the cuts in total federal funds allocated to this program (a loss of $5,367,182 from FFY 81 to FFY 83, resulting in a loss of approximately $3 million in Cook County's fair share) had to be experienced as a real loss to the agencies serving the poor of Cook County.

On the other hand, there were real gains for many of the other counties. Whereas twelve of the 28 counties had received either nothing or considerably less than their fair share in FFY 81, there were only five such counties (DuPage, Champaign, Jackson, Brown, and Pike) in FFY 83. Besides Cook, three other counties (Lake, Winnebago, and Pulaski) received considerably more.

Overall, in terms of fair share, the counties with highest proportions of Illinois' poor fared better under the block grant system.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

TABLE 5

Federal Grants to Illinois for Maternal and Child Health by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1984 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget, 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $15,253,197		FFY84 Block Grants Total $14,204,459**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	7,412,368***	.486***	4,588,295****	.323****
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	62,093	.004
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	83,322	.006
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	-	-	87,402	.006
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	127,679	.009
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	***	***	32,873****	.002****
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	32,722	.002
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	22,500	.001	8,285	.001
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	31,975	.002	39,956	.003
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	13,852	.001
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	-	-	33,110	.002
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	43,253	.003
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	-	-	54,382	.004
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	8,509	.001
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	3,642	.0002

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application, 1984.

** IDPH provided State Fiscal Year 85 data for the Parents Too Soon Prenatal Project. Therefore, the total for Federal Fiscal Year 1984 includes $187,796 from the last quarter of FFY 84 and $740,204 from the first three quarters of FFY 85, a total of $928,000 in federal MCH funds for this prenatal project.

*** An Adolescent pregnancy project sponsored by a private agency serving both Cook and Will Counties was awarded $105,500 (.007).

**** An adolescent pregnancy project sponsored by a private agency serving both Cook and Will Counties was awarded $90,566 (.006).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

TABLE 6

Federal Grants to Illinois for Maternal and Child Health by Counties with the Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1984 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $15,253,197		FFY 84 Block Grants Total $14,204,459**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	***	***
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	***	***
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	***	***
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	3,642	.0002
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	***	***
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	****	****
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	12,093	.001
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	801	.00006
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	257	.00002
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	916	.00006
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	***	***
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	***	***
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	****	****
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	1,635	.0001

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** IDPH provided State Fiscal Year 85 data for the Parents Too Soon Prenatal Project. Therefore, the total for Federal Fiscal Year 1984 includes $187,796 from the last quarter of FFY 84 and $740,204 from the first three quarters of FFY 85, a total of $928,000 in federal MCH funds for this prenatal project.

*** This county was one of seven counties served by a Health Department which was awarded $30,400 (.002).

**** This county was one of three counties served by a Health Department which was awarded $3.922 (.003).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Maternal and Child Health - Tables 5 and 6

FFY 81 Total = $15,253,197			FFY 84 Total = $14,204,459		
Cook	-	1,327,714	Cook	-	3,550,860
St. Clair	-	564,368	St. Clair	-	463,472
Madison	-	289,811	Madison	-	186,563
Lake	-	259,304	Lake	-	154,074
Winnebago	-	244,051	Winnegabo	-	99,592
Will	-	244,051 *	Will	-	194,398 *
DuPage	-	244,051	DuPage	-	194,549
Champaign	-	206,298	Champaign	-	204,782
Peoria	-	196,823	Peoria	-	173,111
Kane	-	198,292	Kane	-	184,440
Sangamon	-	183,038	Sangamon	-	137,344
Rock Island	-	167,785	Rock Island	-	112,996
Macon	-	152,532	Macon	-	87,663
Kankakee	-	137,279	Kankakee	-	119,331
Jackson	-	137 279	Jackson	-	124,198
Pulaski	-	30,506	Pulaski	-	**
Alexander	-	30,506	Alexander	-	**
Pope	-	10,677	Pope	-	**
Hardin	-	12,203	Hardin	-	**
Gallatin	-	15,253	Gallatin	-	***
Greene	-	30,506	Green	-	27,608
Brown	-	10,677	Brown	-	9,686
Hamilton	-	15,253	Hamilton	-	14,204
Pike	-	30,506	Pike	-	27,493
Massac	-	15,253	Massac	-	**
Johnson	-	15,253	Johnson	-	**
Saline	-	45,760	Saline	-	***
Clay	-	15,253	Clay	-	12,569

* Computation excluded grants to an adolescent pregnancy project serving both Cook and Will Counties. In FFY 81, the grant was for $105,000; in FFY 84, it was for $90,566.

** This county and five others in this study were six of seven counties served by one health department. The fair share for the six counties studies was $106,533. The health department, however, received only $30,400. Together, these six counties received approximately $76,133 less than their fair share.

*** This county and one another in this study were two of three counties served by one health department. The fair share for the two counties studies was $56,817. The health department, however, received only $3,922. Together, these two counties received approximately $52,895 less than their fair share.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

The same DPH criteria (allocation on "a per capita basis") are utilized for this grant as for Preventive Health/Health Services (IDPH, 1984:49). This formula is used for allocations distributed "to local entities for prenatal, perinatal, infant follow-up..., family planning, and adolescent pregnancy services..."

Though the Department stated that its priority was "to reduce infant mortality and to promote the health of mothers and children," it did not take into account the easily verifiable fact that infant mortality rates are significantly higher among the poor than in the population at large. Though Cook County has 57% of the poverty population and the highest mortality rate in Illinois, only 46% of the total allocated for distribution to local agencies was allocated to Cook County. (IDPH, 1984 Human Services Plan, Chapter II: 49,68).

Though all counties in the study received considerably less than their fair share of this program's potential grant monies, Cook County was, by far, the biggest loser both in its proportional share (-.087 in FFY 81 and -.250 in FFY 84) and in absolute dollars (over $1 million in FFY 81 and over $3 million in FFY 84).

The question is: Where did the majority of the money go? It was allocated to two types of projects:

1. Research or university projects (5 in 1981 and 3 in 1984) accounted for 33 and 30 percent of the total funds for the respective years.

2. Special projects sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health in areas such as family planning, immunization, perinatal care, lead based paint poisoning, SIDS, and genetic screening accounted for about 18% in FFY 81 and 28% in FFY 84.

How these projects affected individual counties is unknown. What is significant is that they comprised expenditures of 50% of the Maternal and Child Health Care Categorical Grants of FFY 81 and 58% of the Block Grant funds for this program in FFY 84.

Proportionately, funds for research, university, or special projects increased significantly from .504 to.580, while Cook County's proportion decreased from .486 to .323.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES

TABLE 7

Federal Grants to Illinois for Preventive Health and Health Services by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1984 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $2,779,532		FFY 84 Block Grants Total $2,277,317**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	1,250,893	.450	891,144***	.391
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	24,900	.009	48,109	.021
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	50,450	.022
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	31,245	.011	67,611	.030
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	22,850	.008	56,182	.025
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	-	-	39,593***	.017
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	87,481	.038
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	11,280	.004	24,058	.011
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	124,860	.045	44,926	.020
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	35,645	.016
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	4,845	.002	39,301	.017
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	20,191	.009
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	-	-	25,640	.011
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	14,250	.005	17,050	.007
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	15,931	.006	16,464	.007

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application, 1984 .

** Total for FFY 84 includes a remaining unobligated award from FFY 83 for $125,392.

*** Services to rape victims/rape prevention project sponsored by a private agency in Park Forest was awarded $4,600 (.002). Park Forest is located in both Cook and Will Counties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES

TABLE 8

Federal Grants to Illinois for Preventive Health and Health Services by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1984 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $2,779,532**		FFY 84 Block Grants Total $2,277,317**	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	***	***	***	***
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	***	***	***	***
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	***	***	***	***
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	15,931	.006	16,494	.007
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	***	***	***	***
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	****	****	****	****
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	24,900	.009	48,109	.021
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	2,029	.001
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	12,611	.005	3,652	.002
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	12,826	.005	6,819	.003
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	65,445***	.024***	***	***
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	***	***	***	***
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	****	****	****	****
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	16,919	.006	6,197	.003

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application, 1984.

** Total for FFY 84 includes a remaining unobligated award from FFY 83 for $125,392.

***County is one of seven counties derved by a health department which was awarded $35,431 (.013) of the total categorical grants for preventive health/health services in FFY 8. Massac County received an additional grant for health education/risk reduction. For FFY 84. these seven counties accounted for only .011 of Illinois' poverty population; four of these are among the five counties having the highest percentages of poor persons.

**** County is one of three counties served by a health department which was awarded $17,325 (.006) of the total categorical grants for preventive health/health services in FFY 81. For FFY 84, these three counties were awarded $13,649 (.006). While these three counties accounted for only .006 of Illinois' poverty population, two of them are among the fifteen Illinois counties with the highest percentages of poor persons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Preventive Health and Health Services - Tables 7 and 8

FFY 81 Total = $2,779,532			FFY 84 Total = $2,277,317		
Cook	-	341,779	Cook	-	413,759 *
St. Clair	-	77,943	St. Clair	-	36,152
Madison	-	52,811			
Lake	-	16,007	Lake	+	28,897
Winnebago	-	21,623	Winnegabo	+	19,745
Will	-	44,473			
DuPage	-	44,473	DuPage	+	51,044
Champaign	-	30,413			
Peoria	+	83,167	Peoria	+	10,766
Kane	-	36,134			
Sangamon	-	28,509	Sangamon	+	11,973
Rock Island	-	30,575			
Macon	-	27,795			
Green	-	5,559			
Hamilton	-	2,780	Hamilton	-	2,277
Massac	+	62,665 **			
Clay	+	14,139			

* Computation excluded an award of $4,600 to an agency located in Cook and Will Counties

** This county was also one of seven counties served by a health department receiving a grant in the fair share range.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES

Compared to the other five grant programs being analyzed, this is by far the smallest. Nonetheless, like the Maternal and Child Health Care program, it is an extremely important program to the poor, who must generally rely on public health services.

While three counties in the study (Peoria, Massac, and Clay) received considerably more than their fair share in categorical grants for FFY 81, five counties (Lake, Winnegabo, DuPage, Peoria, and Sangamon) received considerably more than their fair share under the block grant system in FFY 84.

What is particularly interesting about this observation is that, while there were two more counties with large proportions of poor people receiving considerably more than their fair share in FFY 84, the total amount of funds in excess of the five counties' fair share was less than the total amount of excess funds allocated to the three counties in FFY 81.

No less significant is the fact that there were far fewer counties (with high proportions of Illinois' poverty population or with high percentages of county residents living below the poverty line) which received considerably less than their fair share under the block grant system as compared to the categorical grant system. Under the former categorical grant system, there were 14 counties which received considerably less than their fair share or no grant at all; whereas, under the block grant system, there were only three. It seems that there was some effort being made to distribute the funds more widely, but some counties benefited from this attempt more than others.

Of the three counties which received considerably less than their fair share (Cook, St. Clair, and Hamilton), Cook County's loss is particularly noteworthy. Though it received considerably less than its fair share under the federal categorical system in FFY 81 (-.123 or $341,779), this situation became even worse under the block grant system in FFY 84 (-.182 or $413,759). Of the 28 counties in this study, it is the only one whose condition became worse.

In its 1984 Human Services Plan, Chapter II, 44, the Illinois Department of Public Health stated:

> ...in keeping with the Department's policy decision that it is a need and right of all citizens in the State, regardless of geographical location, to have available to them Comprehensive Public Health Services in FFY 84, the Department will make the balance of $1,221,216 of FFY 84 funds available for distribution to local entities in the form of block grants. Further, the Department will extend to local entities the federal concepts of flexibility in setting priorities and allocating funds. While the Department has established Comprehensive Public Health Services as the highest priority area, a local entity may indicate that one of the other program areas identified in the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant has a greater need and a higher priority for that geographical area.* The funds will be allocated on a per capita basis to each of the State's eight administrative regions...

Based on the above criteria for distributing funds to local entities, Cook County received allocations for 46% of Illinois' population, though its percentage of the state's poverty population was 57%. Even under the federal categorical system, it did not receive its fair share. In FFY 81, it received 45% of the total allocated to the state, but in FFY 84, under the block grant system, Cook County received only 39%.

In its plan for FFY 84, the Department stated that it planned to "withhold $196,500 of the total Preventive Health and Heatlh Services Block Grant funds awarded to the State in order to assist in providing a minimum level of basic and comprehensive public health programs throughout the State." (IDPH, 1984:43)

Even if Cook County received the entire amount of these discretionary funds, which is unlikely, these funds would not have compensated the county for its overall loss of $413,759 in FFY 84.

*Among its uses, Comprehensive Public Health Services funds are used to support the delivery of services related to food sanitation, potable water supplies, private sewage disposal, solid waste, nuisance control, vector prevention and pest control, and recreational areas.

Administrative Costs

It appears that, since the federal block grant program was instituted, a much higher proportion of federal funds for health services is being used for administration.

In a handout received by members of the Illinois Block Grant Advisory Committee, IDPH reported the following data for administrative costs during the following block grant years:

FY 82	$200,500	(10.2% of the block grant)
FY 83	183,100	(8.7% of the block grant)
FY 84 (est.)	204,500	(9.5% of the block grant)

These figures are considerably higher than the data for administrative costs indicate under the FFY 81 categorical grant program. According to the data received from Springfield, IDPH reported spending only $105,719 (3.8%) of the federal categorical grants for administrative and indirect costs in FFY 81.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

TABLE 9

Federal Grants to Illinois for Mental Health Programs by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1981 and 1984 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 81 Categorical Grants Total: $1,287,604**		SFY 84 Block Grants- M.I. Total $11,375,000***	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	715,131	.555	5,809,100	.511
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	68,019	.053	523,200	.046
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	-	-
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	-	-	350,000	.031
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	49,600	.039	-	-
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	42,000	.033	-	-
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	75,174	.058	605,200	.053
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	-	-	-	-
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	10,900	.008	700,900	.062
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	879,200	.077
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	127,492	.099	-	-
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	138,600	.012
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	12,600	.010	-	-
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	51,864	.040	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** DMH provided data only for the categorical grants of the Developmentally Disabled Services Act.

*** According to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Block Grant Application: Federal Fiscal Year 1985: 32-Appendix A, the final distribution to the category "Mentally Ill" was $8,319,636 for FFY 1984. Data on providers and awards sent by DMH to the researchers, however, yielded a total of $11,375,000 for SFY 1984. It is the latter figure which is used as the total for this report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

TABLE 10

Federal Grants to Illinois for Mental Health Programs by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Year 1981 and 1984 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 81 Categorical Grants Total: $1,287,604**		SFY 84 Block Grants-M.I. Total $11,375,000***	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	51,864	.040	-	-
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	68,019	.053	523,200	.046
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Caly	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** DMH provided data only for the categorical grants of the Developmentally Disabled Services Act.

*** According to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Block Grant Application: Federal Fiscal Year 1985: 32-Appendix A, the final distribution to the category "Mentally Ill" was $8,319,636 for FFY 1984. Data on providers and awards sent by DMH to the researchers, however, yielded a total of $11,375,000 for SFY 1984. It is the latter figure which is used as the total for this report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Mental Health - Tables 9 and 10

(DDSA) SFY 81 Total = $1,287,604	
Cook	- 22,666
St. Clair	+ 20,378
Madison	- 24,464
Lake	- 21,889
Winnebago	+ 28,998
Will	+ 21,398
DuPage	+ 54,572
Champaign	- 19,314
Peoria	- 8,414
Kane	- 16,739
Sangamon	+112,041
Rock Island	- 14,164
Macon	
Kankakee	- 11,588
Jackson	+ 40,276
Pulaski	- 2,575
Alexander	- 2,575
Pope	- 901
Hardin	- 1,030
Gallatin	- 1,288
Greene	- 2,575
Brown	- 901
Hamilton	- 1,288
Pike	- 2,575
Massac	- 1,288
Johnson	- 1,288
Saline	- 3,863
Clay	- 1,288

(MI) SFY 84 Total = $11,375,000	
Cook	- 708,775
St. Clair	+ 102,325
Madison	- 216,125
Lake	+ 156,625
Winnebago	- 182,000
Will	- 182,000
DuPage	+ 423,000
Champaign	- 170,625
Peoria	+ 530,275
Kane	+ 731,325
Sangamon	- 136,500
Macon	- 113,750
Kankakee	- 102,375
Jackson	- 102,375
Pulaski	- 22,750
Alexander	- 22,750
Pope	- 7,963
Hardin	- 9,100
Gallatin	- 11,375
Greene	- 22,750
Brown	- 7,963
Hamilton	- 11,375
Pike	- 22,750
Massac	- 11,375
Johnson	- 11,375
Saline	- 34,125
Clay	- 11,375

TABLE 11

Federal Grants to Illinois for Drug Abuse Programs by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 compared.

Illinois Counties with highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)	Region	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total $3,620,529**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $3,827,190***	
		Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	(2)	705,684	.57348	13.4	N.D.	N.D.	2,024,670 ****	.529 ****
2. St. Clair	(4)	46,511	.03780	17.4	N.D.	N.D.	****	****
3. Madison	(4)	23,895	.01942	9.6	N.D.	N.D.	37,799 ****	.010 ****
4. Lake	(2)	21,884	.01778	5.0	N.D.	N.D.	27,116 ****	.007 ****
5. Winnegabo	(1)	20,580	.01672	8.2	N.D.	N.D.	42,668 ****	.011 ****
6. Will	(2)	20,317	.01651	6.3	N.D.	N.D.	29,754	.008
7. DuPage	(2)	19,818	.01611	3.0	N.D.	N.D.	25,218	.007
8. Champaign	(3)	19,482	.01583	11.6	N.D.	N.D.	7,774 ****	.002 ****
9. Peoria	(1)	18,703	.01520	9.3	N.D.	N.D.	129,913 ****	.034 ****
10. Kane	(2)	16,718	.01359	6.0	N.D.	N.D.	57,495 ****	.015 ****
11. Sangamon	(3)	15,046	.01223	8.5	N.D.	N.D.	51,339 ****	.013 ****
12. Rock Island	(1)	13,624	.01107	8.2	N.D.	N.D.	19,405	.005
13. Macon	(3)	12,803	.01040	9.7	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
14. Kankakee	(2)	12,228	.00994	11.9	N.D.	N.D.	46,562 ****	.012 ****
15. Jackson	(4)	12,168	.00989	19.8	N.D.	N.D.	65,570	.017

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes $847,500 for administration. Data for FFY 81 were provided by region only. A comparison of awards to the four regions for FFY 81 and FFY 83 follows:

Region 1	$ 530,221 (.146)	$ 214,952 (.056)
Region 2	2,866,122 (.792)	3,341,782 (.873)
Region 3	131,792 (.036)	146,425 (.038)
Region 4	92,394 (.026)	124,031 (.032)

*** According to the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Application for FFY 1985, page 30, Appendix A, the final distribution to the Dangerous Drugs Commission was $5,238,974 for FFY 1983 ($4,981,879 for drug abuse services and $257,094 for administration). Data on providers and awards sent by DASA to the researchers accounted for $3,827,190. It is the latter figure which is used as the total for this report.

**** Excludes data on grants for one or more agencies serving multiple counties: 1) an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St.Clair Counties - $395,927 (.103); 2) an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties - $15,058 (.004); 3) an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties - $307,357 (.080); 4) an agency with sites in Cook, Winnegabo, Rock Island, Peoria, Sangamon, Champaign, St. Clair, Jackson, and Madison Counties - $412,625 (.108). Fiscal data for these agencies were not provided by locations of their various sites.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRUG ABUSE PROGRAMS

TABLE 12

Federal Grants to Illinois for Drug Abuse Programs by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

Federal Fiscal Years 1981 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Region	Persons in Poverty			FFY 81 Categorical Grants Total #3,620,529**		FFY 83 Block Grants Total $3,827,190***	
		Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	(4)	2,614	.00212	29.6	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
2. Alexander	(4)	3,217	.00261	26.2	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
3. Pope	(4)	881	.00072	20.0	N.D.	N.D.	- ****	- ****
4. Jackson	(4)	12,168	.00989	19.8	N.D.	N.D.	65,570	.017
5. Hardin	(4)	1,025	.00083	19.0	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
6. Gallatin	(4)	1,347	.00109	17.7	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
7. St. Clair	(4)	46,511	.03780	17.4	N.D.	N.D.	****	****
8. Green	(3)	2,879	.00234	17.3	N.D.	N.D.	6,801	.002
9. Brown	(3)	872	.00071	16.1	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
10. Hamilton	(4)	1,465	.00119	16.0	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
11. Pike	(3)	2,878	.00234	15.2	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
12. Massac	(4)	2,268	.00184	15.1	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
13. Johnson	(4)	1,434	.00117	14.9	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
14. Saline	(4)	4,171	.00339	14.6	N.D.	N.D.	-	-
15. Clay	(4)	2,188	.00178	14.3	N.D.	N.D.	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes $847,500 for administration. Data for FFY 81 were provided by region only. A comparison of awards to the four regions for FFY 81 and FFY 83 follows:

Region 1	$ 530,221 (.146)	$ 214,952 (.056)
Region 2	2,866,122 (.792)	3,341,782 (.873)
Region 3	131,792 (.036)	146,425 (.038)
Region 4	92,394 (.026)	124,031 (.032)

*** According to the Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Application for FFY 1985, page 30, Appendix A, the final distribution to the Dangerous Drugs Commission was $5,238,974 for FFY 1983 ($4,981,879 for drug abuse services and $257,094 for administration). Data on providers and awards sent by DASA to the researchers accounted for $3,827,190. It is the latter figure which is used as the total for this report.

**** Excludes data on grants for one or more agencies serving multiple counties: 1) an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St.Clair Counties - $395,927 (.103); 2) an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties - $15,058 (.004); 3) an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties - $307,357 (.080); 4) an agency with sites in Cook, Winnegabo, Rock Island, Peoria, Sangamon, Champaign, St. Clair, Jackson, and Madison Counties - $412,625 (.108). Fiscal data for these agencies were not provided by locations of their various sites.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNTIES RECEIVING MORE (+) OR LESS (-) THAN THEIR FAIR SHARE

Drug Abuse Programs - Tables 11 and 12

FFY 81 Total = $3,620,529

No Data for Counties-

Data for Region Only *

FFY 83 Total = $3,827,190

Cook	-	168,310	**
St. Clair	-	141,606	**
Madison	-	34,918	**
Lake	-	37,946	**
Winnebago	-	18,567	**
Will	-	31,481	
DuPage	-	36,017	
Champaign	-	49,634	**
Peoria	+	72,505	**
Rock Island	-	22,694	**
Macon	-	38,272	
Jackson	+	31,125	**
Pulaski	-	7,654	
Alexander	-	7,654	
Pope	-	118	
Hardin	-	135	
Gallatin	-	3,827	
Brown	-	118	
Hamilton	-	3,827	
Pike	-	7,654	
Massac	-	3,827	
Johnson	-	3,827	
Saline	-	11,482	
Clay	-	3,827	

* Allocations for regions were as follows:

	FFY 81		FFY 83	
Region 1	$ 530,221	(.146)	$ 214,952	(.056)
Region 2	2,866,122	(.792)	3,341,782	(.873)
Region 3	131,792	(.036)	146,425	(.038)
Region 4	92,394	(.026)	124,031	(.032)

** Excluded grants to agencies serving two or more counties. See Tables for details

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH

Before offering some analysis of the data presented on the Drug Abuse and Mental Health components of this block grant, some discussion of the limitations of these data is in order. There were several problems with the data for this grant:

1. The Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services Block Grant Application for 1985 reported data for federal fiscal year (FFY) 1984. All publicly circulated plans and reports involving federal money generally use this format. Nonetheless, data sent by DMH on providers of mental health services and their awards reported data for state fiscal year (SFY) 1984.

   Though the Block Grant Application for 1985 reports that the final distribution of funds for the program component "Mentally Ill" was $8,319,636 for FFY 84, the data sent to us for SFY 84 yielded a total of $11,375,000. Since the state fiscal year begins July 1 and the federal fiscal year begins October 1, the breakdown data presented on counties actually represents the last quarter of FFY 83 and the first three quarters of FFY 84. (This was the explanation given to me by a source in Springfield for the $3 million difference.)

2. No data were provided on the Alcohol component of this program. In terms of federal dollars, this is the smallest of the three components and appears the most vulnerable. (See the 1985 Application.)

3. Federal fiscal data for SFY 81 are problematic for both the drug abuse and mental health components. DASA was able to report data only by regions for the drug abuse component and DMH provided data on only one fairly small categorical grant funded under the Developmentally Disabled Services Act. It seems highly unlikely that this was the only categorical grant for mental health for FFY 81. In fact, data on the M.I. Block Grant 1985 Application imply that grants to many providers were operational during the categorical grant period. (See the 1985 Application, p. 6 - Grants to CMHC's, Appendices B and D.) Why DMH did not provide data on categorical grants funded under the Community Mental Health Centers Act is not known.

Having acknowledged these limitations of the data, I will point out some major findings for each of the two components for which we received data. However, I will not compare the two years, since the data for mental health appear to be quite incomplete for SFY 81 and the data reported by DASA for FFY 81 were not comparable to FFY 83.

MENTAL HEALTH

Of the 28 counties studies, 21 received either no DDSA grant or a grant which was considerably less than its fair share in SFY 81. Eight of these counties were among the 15 with the highest proportions of poor people, and the differences between their proportions of Illinois' poverty population and their proportions of federal funds were quite high, ranging from -.018% for Cook County to -.007% for Peoria County. However, when translated into dollars, Cook County lost only $22,666 of its fair share and Peoria County lost $8,414.

Only one county (Macon) received its fair share.

Six counties received considerably more than their fair shares. Among those counties, Sangamon led with a significant difference of +.087, followed by Dupage (+.042), Jackson (+.031), Winnebago (+.023), Will (+.017) and St. Clair (+.016). In terms of dollars, this means that Sangamon received $112,041 more than its fair share, followed by Du Page ($54,572), Jackson ($40,276), Winnebago ($28,998), Will ($21,398) and St. Clair ($20,378). It is clear from these figures that the gain to those counties which gained is greater than the loss to those who received considerably less than their fair share. However, given the smallness of this grant, it is difficult to imagine its having much impact from being divided proportionately among the counties.

It is important to note that the counties which received considerably more than their fair shares are fairly evenly divided among the four DMH regions: Region 1 Winnebago, Region 2 Will and DuPage, Region 3 Sangamon, and Region 4 St. Clair and Jackson. Since I believe application for categorical grants were reviewed by the relevant department of the state, this distribution may have been, to some extent, a policy decision at the state level.

In any case, regional distribution for this small grant appears fairly good. One would have to analyze the data for all 102 counties to evaluate whether or not this actually was the case.

For SFY 84, 21 of the 28 counties studied received no federal MI block grant monies for mental health services; one (Cook County) received considerably less than its fair share; and five (St.Clair, Lake, DuPage, Peoria, and Kane Counties) received considerably more than their fair shares. Only one county (Rock Island) received a grant in the fair share range.

Nine of the 15 counties with highest proportion of the poor received either nothing or an amount considerably less than a fair share. The total amount which these 9 counties lost was $1,904,525. The total amount gained, over and beyond their fair shares, by St.Clair, Lake, DuPage, Peoria and Kane Counties was $1,943,750, an amount somewhat more than that lost by the 9 counties not receiving a fair share.

Although this difference may be able to be explained by a rationale based on regions if all 102 counties were analyzed, these data do not indicate such a rationale. Of the five counties receiving more than their fair share, three (Lake, DuPage, and Kane) counties are in DMH Region 2, while all counties in this study located in Region 3 received no grants at all.

While further analysis of data on all Illinois counties may reveal a somewhat different picture for the four DMH regions, it seems strange, and inequitable, that public mental health funds are not being targeted for the majority of counties having the highest proportions of Illinois' poverty population or the highest percentages of county residents living in circumstances of poverty. It is primarily the poor who must use public services and who often lack transportation or money to travel long distances. In an era of community mental health and diversion of the mentally ill from institutionalization, this seems strange indeed.

Although DMH included in its FFY 85 Application "funding per person in poverty" as a criterion for its SFY 85 evaluation of mental health services to block grant recipients, this is an inadequate measure if clients (or potential clients) do not have access to mental health services. Some of the poor may be, and probably are, getting nothing.

Drug Abuse

Though it appears that 22 of the 28 counties studied received either no federal grant monies or considerably less than their fair share for drug abuse programs in FFY 83, such is probably not the case. Seven of these counties were served by agencies with sites in more than one county and data on providers' allocations of funds to these sites were not reported by DASA. (This was the case with several other departments in this study.)

Cook County was served by four such agencies, while Lake was served by three, St. Clair by two, and Madison, Winnebago, Champaign and Rock Island were each served by one. Grants to such agencies totaled $1.1 million, an amount sufficient to more than offset each of these county's losses, if these grants were allocated equitably by the providers. Since this cannot be assumed, the data are presented as reported.

This ambiguity in the data demonstrates the necessity of reporting, not only where public funds are sent, but where such funds actually serve clients. Furthermore, it raises the possibility that, where large amounts of money are involved, some counties which appear to be receiving a fair share or even less than a fair share may, in fact, be receiving more than their fair share.

In any case, it is quite clear that 2 of the 15 counties with the highest proportions of Illinois poverty population (Will and DuPage) received considerably less than their fair shares, and one (Macon) received no block grant for drug abuse services at all.

Only two of these 15 counties (Peoria and Jackson) clearly received considerably more than their fair shares. Though its fair share for FFY 83 was $57,408, Peoria County received $72,505 in excess of its fair share. In addition, it was one of the counties served by an agency with sites in more than one county. Therefore, the foregoing figure is best regarded as a conservative estimate of how much money Peoria County received over and beyond its fair share of block grant funds for drug abuse.

Jackson County's portion in excess of its fair share was $31,125. It, too, was served by an agency located in more than one county, alerting us to the fact that the foregoing figure probably underestimates the amount Jackson County received in excess of its fair share of block grant funds for drug abuse services.

Of the 15 counties with highest percentages of county residents living in poverty, only Jackson County clearly received more than its fair share, though for reasons discussed earlier St.Clair County may have received more also. One county (Greene) received a grant in the fair share range, and 12 of these counties received no grant under the block grant program for drug abuse in FFY 83.

All of these 15 counties are located in either Region 3 or 4 of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse; most are in Region 4. As can be seen in a footnote of Table 12, these two regions received very small portions of block grant funds for drug abuse programs in both FFY 81 and FFY 83 --each about 3% to 4%. Whether this percentage corresponds with the proportion of Illinois' poverty population in the region is a question beyond the scope of this study, but one which is of the utmost importance to sparsely populated areas with high percentages of poor people with perhaps little organized representation of their interests.

TITLE XX SOCIAL SERVICES - DONATED FUNDS INITIATIVE - SUMMARY

TABLE 13

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Services Programs (Donated Funds Initiative) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $18,015,849**		SFY 83 Social Services -DFI Block Grants Total $16,896,871	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	9,054,375 ***	.503 ***	8,310,788 ****	.492 ****
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	311,286 ***	.017 ***	69,529 ****	.004 ****
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	197,079 ***	.011 ***	198,409 ****	.012 ****
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	570,907	.032	370,282	.022
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01682	8.2	433,149	.024	259,581	.015
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	324,422	.018	289,374	.017
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	147,488 ***	.008 ***	197,827 ****	.012 ****
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	231,681 *****	.013 *****	291,358 *****	.017 *****
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	368,461	.020	445,930	.026
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	327,422 ***	.018 ***	200,678 ****	.012 ****
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	1,677,814 ***	.093 ***	1,842,575	.109
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	273,210	.015	263,159	.016
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	478,864	.027	276,708	.016
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	255,242	.014	88,491	.005
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	664,368	.037	775,271	.046

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes a grant of $900,000 to the Department of Public Health. The grant was awarded by DPH for family planning, but the designated agency's name and address were not provided. SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980, were supplied after these tables had been constructed using the first batch of data provided for SFY 80 by DPA. Overall, for the grand total of all DFI contracts considered in this report, there was a difference of only +$11,436. An increase in two DOA contracts amounting to $11,532 and a decrease in one DMH contract of $96 accounted for this increase. Only one county in this study was involved: St. Clair received an increase of $1,632 from DOA, an amount which, when it was recalculated with the new total for all DOA contracts, yielded a proportion of .031. (See Tables 15 and 16.) St.Clair County's proportion of all DFI contract funds remained the same as that reported on this Table.

*** Excludes grants to agencies located in more than one county: 1) from DCFS, $60,736 to an agency with sites in Cook, Champaign and Madison Counties, and $21,671 to an agency with sites in Cook and Rock Island Counties; 20 from DDC, $414,948 to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St. Clair Counties. The total allocation for Sangamon County includes $1,399,578 granted by DPA to an agency with headquarters in this county but which funds various centers throughout the state.

**** Excludes grants to agencies located in more than one county: 1) from DCFS, $127,403 to an agency with sites in Champaign and Madison Counties; 2) from DDC, $396,865 to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St. Clair Counties; 3) from DDC, $267,196 to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties; 4) from DMH/DD, $68,668 to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties. The total allocation for Sangamon County includes $1,564,000 granted by DPA to an agency with headquarters in this county, but which funds various centers throughout the state.

***** According to a source at DPA, the City of Peoria has a service center which serves four counties, including its own. Such may be the case for some other counties as well, but unless documentation is provided, it is impossible to report such data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TITLE XX SOCIAL SERVICES - DONATED FUNDS INITIATIVE - SUMMARY

TABLE 14

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative) by Counties with the Highest Percentage of County Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $18,015,849**		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $16,896,871	
	Number	Proportion of State	$ of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	664,368	.037	775,271	.046
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	11,723	.001	14,433	.001
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	- ***	- ***	- ****	- ****
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	311,286	.017	69,529	.004
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	118,115	.007	42,052	.002
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes a grant of $900,000 to the Department of Public Health. The grant was awarded by DPH for family planning, but the designated agency's name and address were not provided. SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980, were supplied after these tables had been constructed using the first batch of data provided for SFY 80 by DPA. Overall, for the grand total of all DFI contracts considered in this report, there was a difference of only +$11,436. An increase in two DOA contracts amounting to $11,532 and a decrease in one DMH contract of $96 accounted for this increase. Only one county in this study was involved: St. Clair received an increase of $1,632 from DOA, an amount which, when it was recalculated with the new total for all DOA contracts, yielded a proportion of .031.

(See Tables 15 and 16.) St.Clair County's proportion of all DFI contract funds remained the same as that reported on this Table.

*** Excludes grants to agencies located in more than one county: 1) from DCFS, $60,736 to an agency with sites in Cook, Champaign and Madison Counties, and $21,671 to an agency with sites in Cook and Rock Island Counties; 20 from DDC, $414,948 to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St. Clair Counties. The total allocation for Sangamon County includes $1,399,578 granted by DPA to an agency with headquarters in this county but which funds various centers throughout the state.

**** Excludes grants to agencies located in more than one county: 1) from DCFS, $127,403 to an agency with sites in Champaign and Madison Counties; 2) from DDC, $396,865 to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St. Clair Counties; 3) from DDC, $267,196 to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties; 4) from DMH/DD, $68,668 to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties. The total allocation for Sangamon County includes $1,564,000 granted by DPA to an agency with headquarters in this county, but which funds various centers throughout the state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Title XX - Social Services: Donated Funds Initiative
(Total for All Grants Awarded by the Department of Public Aid and Its Allied Agencies)

SFY 80 Total = $18,015,849			SFY 83 Total = $16,896,872		
Cook	-	1,268,706 *	Cook	-	1,371,119 *
St. Clair	-	355,299 *	St. Clair	-	555,655 *
Madison	-	145,222 *	Madison	-	122,632 *
Lake	+	264,638 *	Lake	+	83,036 *
Winnebago	+	144,895			
DuPage	-	140,765			
Champaign					
Peoria	+	98,223	Peoria	+	192,477
Kane	+	93,216			
Sangamon	+	1,461,625 **	Sangamon	+	1,639,813 **
			Rock Island	+	77,293
Macon	+	298,706	Macon	+	107,739
Kankakee	+	93,099			
Jackson	+	502,225	Jackson	+	623,199
Pulaski	-	36,032	Pulaski	-	33,794
Alexander	-	36,032	Alexander	-	33,794
Pope	-	12,611	Pope	-	11,828
Gallatin	-	18,016	Gallatin	-	16,897
Greene	-	36,032	Greene	-	33,794
Browne	-	12,611	Brown	-	11,828
Hamilton	-	18,016	Hamilton	-	16,897
Pike	-	36,032	Pike	-	33,794
Massac	-	18,016	Massac	-	16,897
Johnson	-	18,016	Johnson	-	16,897
Clay	-	14,016	Clay	-	16,897

* Excludes grants to agencies serving two or more counties. See Tables for details.

** Includes a grant to an agency which distributed funds throughout the state: #1,399,578 in SFY 80 and $1,564,000 in SFY 83.

TITLE XX- SOCIAL SERVICES - DONATED FUNDS INITIATIVE

(See Title XX - Social Services Report for SFY 83 - IDPA, p. 6 for explanation of DFI.)

DFI was selected because it is the only component of the Title XX - Social Services grant program for which DPA could track Title XX money to providers, and, thereby, we could track it to counties. DPA directly administers the program for participating public and private agencies. Participants are guaranteed 75 percent federal funding for their contracts with DPA or one of its allied agencies if they raise 25 percent of the funds, or some funding source raises it for them. Therefore, it is possible to assess how much federal money actually goes to these agencies under the DFI program when one knows the amount of money involved in their contracts.

On the other hand, general block grant funds for social services administered by DPA or one of its allied agencies are commingled with state funds in the General Revenue Fund when federal reimbursements are made to the state. While it would be possible for the various Departments of the state to supply data on providers and the amounts of their block grants, with one exception, such data were not forthcoming or able to be used in the forms presented. Only the Department of Rehabilitation Services supplied the data requested.

DFI funds comprise a comparatively small portion of the federal funds received by the state for Title XX - Social Services. Exactly what their proportion is is difficult to say, since the Annual Reports on Title XX do not report total federal reimbursements for expenditures. All expenditures reported relate to state General Revenue Fund (GRF) appropriations, not to federal reimbursements --unless the amounts are the same. (See Title XX Report for SFY 83, pp. 14, 19, 22, 26, 28, 33, 35, 35.)

The total Title XX expenditures reported under the aegis of the GRF appropriation totaled $240,617,100, almost twice the amount of the federal ceiling or allocation for SFY 83.

While the Report for SFY 83 reports the total federal funds available, it makes a point of stating that "this amount does not necessarily coincide with the amounts claimed or received by the state for Fiscal Year 1983 due to the structure of the claiming mechanism and the difference in periods of time encompassed by the State and Federal Fiscal Years."

In any case, one can estimate the percentage of federal Title XX funds which are utilized for the DFI component by multiplying the total funds for all DFI contracts in a state fiscal year by .75 and dividing the product by the figure for the federal ceiling for Title XX funds in the same fiscal year.

Using 1) the total dollars for contracts covered in this report ($18,015,849 for SFY 80 and $16,896,871 for SFY 83) and 2) the Title XX ceilings for Illinois ($143,185,600 in SFY 80 and $122,192,600 in SFY 83) as basic data yielded the following finding: Federal Title XX money utilized by the DFI component comprises about 10 percent of all Title XX monies available to the State of Illinois (9.4 percent in SFY 80 and 10.4 percent in SFY 83.)

Since the Title XX grant is by far the largest of all block grants to the State of Illinois, and the DFI portion is a comparatively small and unrepresentative part of this grant (as pointed out by our sources at DPA), no generalizations or conclusions about this grant as a whole can be drawn from the following analysis of the data on the Donated Funds Initiative component. However, just as the foregoing presentation indicates a puzzling (or certainly not a straightforward) approach to the matter of accounting for a very large grant, so too the following analysis of DFI data for SFY 80 and SFY 83 can be used to raise questions for further study of Title XX as a whole.

In spite of limitations, the study of DFI grants is a worthwhile one on its own merits. The state takes pride in having created what appears to be a unique mechanism for engaging the private sector in fundraising for social services, and according to a source at DPA, "the private agencies are invested in and like the program."

No less important is the fact that the DFI component of the Title XX grant program alone involved more federal dollars than those reported by three other grant programs in this study. (Federal funds accounted for $14,186,887 in SFY 80 and $12,672,654 in SFY 83.) Therefore, though DFI funds comprise a small portion of the total Title XX grant program, these funds, nonetheless, are not a small amount of federal money. On this basis alone, this component is worth investigating.

Before beginning an analysis of the data for this grant program, I suggest that, if the reader is interested in the grants which comprise the total for Title XX - Social Services - DFI, he or she should refer to Tables 15 through 30. Though they are not discussed in this report, they offer the reader some explanation for the total figures for DFI.

Under the federal categorical system of SFY 80, only five of the 28 counties in this study received a fair share of Title XX federal funds through the Donated Funds Initiative (DFI: Will, Champaign, Rock Island, Hardin, and Saline Counties. Though the number increased to eight under the block grant system, the increase is too small to be considered significant.

In SFY 83, the counties receiving a fair share of federal funds through participation in DFI were as follows: Winnebago, Will, DuPage, Champaign, Kane, Kankakee, Hardin and Saline.

In both categorical and block grant years, most of the counties studied received either nothing or less than their fair shares of federal money for Title XX under DFI; 15 counties in SFY 80 and 14 in SFY 83.

Cook and St. Clair Counties, the two counties in Illinois with the highest proportions of the state's poor people, not only were among those counties receiving considerably less than their fair shares of federal funds for social services through DFI, but their shares actually decreased, not only in money, but also in proportion under the block grant system of SFY 83.

Before closing this discussion of Cook and St. Clair Counties, some comment must be made about DFI grants which went to agencies known to have sites in more than one county (See Table 13, footnote ***). Some may argue that Cook County probably got most of these funds granted to agencies located in Cook and one or more other counties.

However, even if agency sites in Cook County had received the total amount of such funds in SFY 80, Cook County's proportion of the total for all Title XX - DFI funds would have been .545; still considerably less (-.028) than its fair share (.573.)

The same is true for SFY 83, though its proportion of the total would have been smaller (.535), and the proportional difference between this hypothetical share and its fair share would have been larger (-.038) than the foregoing comparable hypothetical figure for SFY 80; again considerably less than its fair share.

Lastly, among the 15 counties having the highest percentages of county residents living in poverty, 11 counties received no federal funds through DFI. Though one or more of these counties may have been provided with services by neighboring counties utilizing federal funds under DFI, the data as reported do not substantiate this possibility.

While most of the counties in this study received considerably less than their fair shares in both years studied, eight counties appear to have received considerably more through DFI under the federal categorical system of SFY 80 (Lake, Winnebago, Peoria, Kane, Sangamon, Macon, Kankakee, and Jackson Counties) compared to six under the block grant system in SFY 83 (Lake, Peoria, Sangamon, Rock Island, Kankakee, and Jackson Counties).

As pointed out in footnotes for Table 13, it is quite probable that Peoria and Sangamon Counties did not actually receive more than their fair shares of Title XX federal funds through DFI, but lacking complete data, we simply do not know whether they did or not. Perhaps some of the other counties which received considerably more than their share provided services to other counties' residents as well. We simply do not know, given the limitations of the data as reported.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

According to a source at DPA, "There are no reporting requirements, federal or state, for DFI." Though the Title XX Report for SFY 83 included providers (agencies) which participated in the program, the report for SFY 80 did not. Even the inclusion of such data without some organization of it by counties or regions is fairly unenlightening.

These data are organized by the allied agencies with which DFI providers have contracts for certain amounts of DFI grant money. Both for the DFI component and for Title XX as a whole, DPA reports allocations and expenditures by types of service programs, not by the counties or even regions in which services are received, nor by income categories of clients receiving such services.

Reported fiscal data are organized only by categories of interest to those who organize the field of social services--professionals and administrators in the field. The data tell us only how much money certain types of programs receive. They tell us nothing or very little about the recipients of the services which the programs provide. Because of this, there is no way to ascertain overall and with any degree of certitude how much of this money is used to provide or purchase services for those who need but cannot purchase such services for themselves or their families.

Even our use of DFI funds allocated to "counties with the highest proportions of state residents in poverty" and "counties with the highest percentages of county residents in poverty" is based on an assumption that such funds are actually being used to serve the poor.

Probably, 1) where there are large concentrations of poor people and 2) the field of social services is organized to serve them, this is the case. However, given the lack of concrete data on this, the best we could do for this study was construct indicators of populations without the financial resources to purchase social services when they need them.

The indicators are not measures of who actually received social services in these 28 counties. Only those providing such services are capable of gathering such data and reporting it.

DEPARTMENT ON AGING

TABLE 15

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative--Department on Aging Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $900,378.59**		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $1,000,000	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	145,182.95**	.161	142,521	.143
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	26,649.15	.030**	16,012	.016
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	33,827.04	.038	51,712	.052
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	-	-	-	-
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	11,217	.011
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	49,200.00	.055	-	-
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	30,225.48	.034	33,501	.034
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	99,732.00	.111	76,739	.077
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	29,396.40	.033	25,321	.025
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	34,422.78	.038	51,611	.052
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	-	-
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	-	-	-	-
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	36,480.00	.041	41,657	.042

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application, 1984.

** SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980,were sent later by Springfield, but after these Tables had been constructed. These data indicated an overall increase of $11,532 in DOA contracts, with St. Clair County having received $1,632 of this amount. Its proportion of the total DFI-DOA funds increased to .031.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT ON AGING

TABLE 16

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative--Department on Aging Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentage of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $900,378.59**		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $1,000,000	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	36,480.00	.041	41,657	.042
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	11,723.80	.013	14,433	.014
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	26,649.15	.030**	16,012	.016
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

*See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

**SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980, were sent later by Springfield, but after these Tables had been constructed. These data indicated an overall increase of $11,532 in DOA contracts, with St. Clair County having received $1,632 of this amount. Its proportion of the total DFI-DOA funds increased to .031.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICE

TABLE 17

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Children and Family Service Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Year 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $2,659,880		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $2,264,507	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	1,006,550 **	.378 **	952,679	.421
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	25,286 **	.010 **	***	***
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	431,734	.162	215,740	.095
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	98,635	.037	51,176	.023
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	-	-	-	-
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	**	**	***	***
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	77,712	.029	73,601	.033
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	-	-
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	-	-	-	-
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	121,508 **	.046 **	122,266	.054
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	37,254	.014	42,867	.019
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	89,933	.034	30,493	.013
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	531,205	.200	516,707	.228

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes grants from DCFS to agencies located in more than one county: $60,736 (.073) to an agency with sites in Cook, Champaign and Madison Counties; $21,671 (.008) to an agency with sites in Cook and Rock Island Counties.

*** Excludes a grant from DCFS to an agency located in more than one county: $127,403 (.056) to an agency with sites in Champaign and Madison Counties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICE

TABLE 18

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Children and Family Service Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $2,659,880		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $2,264,507	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	531,205	.200	516,707	.228
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	64,013	.024	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

TABLE 19

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Delinquency Prevention - CDP/DCFS Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $1,765,972		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $1,800,501	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	868,942	.492	970,638	.539
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	24,612	.014	-	-
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	28,971	.016	39,722	.022
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	40,896	.023	-	-
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	186,089	.105	156,465	.087
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	33,660	.019	32,005	.018
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	55,209	.031	33.384	.019
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	94,734	.054	106,370	.059
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	-	-
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	-	-	-	-
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	18,726	.011	14,003	.008
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	50,345	.029	50,804	.028
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	44,886	.025	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	13,304	.008	97,452	.054

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

TABLE 20

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Delinquency Prevention - CDP/DCFS Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $1,765,972		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $1,800,501	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	13,304	.008	97,452	.054
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	24,612	.014	-	-
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.o	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	54,102	.031	42,052	.023
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

*See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

TABLE 21

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Corrections Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State REsidents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grant s Total $2,406,789		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grant s Total $2,653,860	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	1,504,251	.625	2,095,908	.790
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	207,450	.086	20,000	.008
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	-	-
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	-	-	-	-
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	-	-
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	23,726	.010	104,538	.039
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	-	-	118,000	.044
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	-	-	70,000	.026
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	201,480	.084	62,830	.024
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	114,480	.048	128,784	.049
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	-	-
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	149,200	.062	-	-
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	43,800	.017

* See Illlinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

TABLE 22

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Corrections Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $2,406,789		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $2,653,860	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	43,800	.017
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	207,450	.086	20,000	.008
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DANGEROUS DRUGS COMMISSION

TABLE 23

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Dangerous Drugs Commission Contracts) by Counties with the Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared.

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of The Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $1,115,137		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $1,168,985	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	560,792**	.503**	228,259***	.195***
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	**	**	***	***
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	23,323	.020	22,204	.019
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	**	**	53,839***	.046***
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	40,722	.035
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	-	-	21,751	.019
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	-	-	-	-
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	-	-	30,000	.026
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	-	-
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	**	**	***	***
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	-	-
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	-	-	-	-
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	75,074	.067	57,998	.050
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	42,000	.038	32,400	.028

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes a grant from DDC to an agency located in more than one county: $414,948 (.317) to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon, and St. Clair Counties.

***Excludes grants from DDC to angecies located in more than one county: $396,865 (.339) to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon and St. Clair Counties; $267,196 (.229) to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DANGEROUS DRUGS COMMISSION

TABLE 24

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Dangerous Drugs Commission Contracts) by Counties with the Highest Percentage of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of The Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $1,115,173		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $1,168,985	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	42,000	.038	32,400	.028
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	**	**	***	***
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** Excludes a grant from DDC to an agency located in more than one county: $414,948 (.317) to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon and St. Clair Counties.

*** Excludes a grant from DDC to an agency located in more than one county: $396,865 (.339) to an agency with sites in Cook, Lake, Sangamon and St. Clair Counties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

TABLE 25

Federal Grants to Illinois Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Mental Health Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $4,871,258**		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $4,227,075	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	2,344,170	.481	1,849,312 ***	.437 **
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	52,575	.011	33,517	.008
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	86,672	.018	84,771	.020
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	54,671	.011	71,932 **	.017 **
5. Winnegabo	20,580	.01672	8.2	148,425	.030	-	-
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	124,482	.026	131,080	.031
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	147,488	.030	197,827	.047
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	108,178	.022	64,322	.015
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	96,283	.020	89,220	.021
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	96,545	.020	112,527	.027
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	129,333	.027	98,180	.023
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	132,976	.027	126,890	.030
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	187,812	.039	167,728	.040
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	45,349	.009	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	41,379	.008	43,255	.010

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980, were sent later by Springfield, but after these Tables had been constructed. These data indicated a decrease of $96 for one DMH contract, an amount insufficient to affect any of the data in this Table.

*** Excludes a grant from DMH to an agency located in more than one county: $68,668 (.016) to an agency with sites in Cook and Lake Counties

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

TABLE 26

Federal Grants to Illinois Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Mental Health Contracts) by Counties with the Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $4,871,258 **		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $4,227,075	
	Number	Proportionof State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	41,379	.008	43,255	.010
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	52,575	.011	33,517	.008
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** SFY 80 data for providers and contract amounts are those as of February 1, 1980. Data as of June 30, 1980, were sent later by Springfield, but after these Tables had been constructed. These data indicated a decrease of $96 for one DMH contract, an amount insufficient to affect any of the data in this Table.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AID

TABLE 27

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Public Aid Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportion of State Residents in Poverty. (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $3,668,953		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $3,104,369	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	2,094,346	.571	1,469,447	.473
2. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	-	-
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	43,606	.012	28,771	.009
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	-	-
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	93,354	.025	-	-
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	38,069	.010	42,151	.014
9. Peoria	18,702	.01520	9.3	-	-	-	-
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	- **	- **	- **	- **
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	1,399,578	.381	1,564,000	.504
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	-	-
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	-	-	-	-
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

** This grant from DPA to an organization with headquarters in Springfield was allocated to various service centers throughout the state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AID

TABLE 28

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Public Aid Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total #3,668,953		SFY 83 Social Service-DFI Block Grants Total $3,104,369	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-
5. Hardin	1,025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

TABLE 29

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Vocational Rehabilitation/Rehabilitation Services Contracts) by Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Proportions of State Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of the Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $627,479		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $677,574	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Cook	705,684	.57348	13.4	530,140	.845	602,024	.888
2. St Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
3. Madison	23,895	.01942	9.6	-	-	-	-
4. Lake	21,884	.01778	5.0	-	-	-	-
5. Winnebago	20,580	.01672	8.2	-	-	-	-
6. Will	20,317	.01651	6.3	-	-	-	-
7. DuPage	19,818	.01611	3.0	-	-	-	-
8. Champaign	19,482	.01583	11.6	-	-	-	-
9. Peoria	18,703	.01520	9.3	-	-	-	-
10. Kane	16,718	.01359	6.0	-	-	-	-
11. Sangamon	15,046	.01223	8.5	-	-	-	-
12. Rock Island	13,624	.01107	8.2	-	-	-	-
13. Macon	12,803	.01040	9.7	54,253	.086	15,300	.023
14. Kankakee	12,228	.00994	11.9	-	-	-	-
15. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-

* See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

TABLE 30

Federal Grants to Illinois for Social Service Programs (Donated Funds Initiative - Department of Vocational Rehabilitation/Rehabilitation Services Contracts) by Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty.

State Fiscal Years 1980 and 1983 Compared

Illinois Counties with Highest Percentages of County Residents in Poverty (Illinois Bureau of Budget 1982)*	Persons in Poverty			SFY 80 Title XX - DFI Categorical Grants Total $627,499		SFY 83 Social Services-DFI Block Grants Total $677,574	
	Number	Proportion of State	% of County	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total	Allocation Federal $	Proportion of Total
1. Pulaski	2,614	.00212	29.6	-	-	-	-
2. Alexander	3,217	.00261	26.2	-	-	-	-
3. Pope	881	.00072	20.0	-	-	-	-
4. Jackson	12,168	.00989	19.8	-	-	-	-
5. Hardin	1.025	.00083	19.0	-	-	-	-
6. Gallatin	1,347	.00109	17.7	-	-	-	-
7. St. Clair	46,511	.03780	17.4	-	-	-	-
8. Greene	2,879	.00234	17.3	-	-	-	-
9. Brown	872	.00071	16.1	-	-	-	-
10. Hamilton	1,465	.00119	16.0	-	-	-	-
11. Pike	2,878	.00234	15.2	-	-	-	-
12. Massac	2,268	.00184	15.1	-	-	-	-
13. Johnson	1,434	.00117	14.9	-	-	-	-
14. Saline	4,171	.00339	14.6	-	-	-	-
15. Clay	2,188	.00178	14.3	-	-	-	-

*See Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Illinois Community Services Block Grant Application 1984.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FAIR SHARE COMPARISONS: CATEGORICAL AND BLOCK GRANTS

In order to evaluate how the counties with the greatest concentrations of poor people in the State of Illinois fared from federal grants to Illinois, a county's proportion of the state's poverty population can be compared to that county's proportion of various federal grants, either to Illinois agencies (categorical grants) or to the State of Illinois (block grants).

Using 1) a county's proportion of Illinois' poverty population and 2) the proportion of federal funds the county's public or private agencies received in grants as measures of comparison yielded the following findings:

A. For the following grant programs, many of the counties studied received considerably less than their fair share (either nothing or a difference of -.005 or more between a county's proportion of poor persons and its proportion of federal funds). Differences are in parentheses.

FEDERAL CATEGORICAL GRANT	STATE BLOCK GRANT
Energy Assistance	
FFY 81	FFY 83
1. Cook (-.171)	1. Cook (-.151)
2. St. Clair (-.037)*	2. St. Clair (-.011)
Community Services	
1. Madison (-.008)	1. Brown **
2. Lake (-.007)	2. Champaign **
3. Winnebago (-.005)	3. DuPage **
4. Will (-.005)	4. Jackson **
5. Brown *	5. Pike **
6. Champaign *	
7. DuPage*	
8. Hardin *	
9. Jackson *	
10. Pike *	
11. Pope *	
12. Rock Island ***	

Maternal and Child Health

FFY 81

1. Cook (-.087) ****
2. Champaign (-.014)
3. Peoria (-.013)
4. All other counties in this study *

FFY 84

1. Cook (-.250) ****
2. St. Clair (-.033)
3. Champaign (-.014)
4. DuPage (-.014)
5. Will (-.014) ****
6. Madison (-.013)
7. Kane (-.012)
8. Peoria (-.012)
9. Lake (-.011)
10. Sangamon (-.010)
11. Alexander)
12. Hardin)
13. Johnson) (-.009) ****
14. Massac)
15. Pope)
16. Pulaski)
17. Jackson (-.008)
18. Kankakee (-.008)
19. Rock Island (-.008)
20. Winnebago (-.007)
21. Macon (-.007)
22. Galatin) (-.005) ****
23. Saline)
24. Hamilton **

Preventive Health and Health Services

FFY 81

1. Cook (-.123)
2. St. Clair (-.028)
3. Champaign (-.011)
4. Sangamon (-.010)
5. Winnebago (-.008)
6. Lake (-.006)
7. DuPage *
8. Hamilton *
9. Kane *
10. Macon *
11. Madison *
12. Rock Island *
13. Will *

FFY 84

1. Cook (-.182) ****
2. St. Clair (-.016)
3. Hamilton **

Mental Health

SFY 81

1. Madison (-.019) *
2. Cook (-.018)
3. Lake (-.017) *
4. Champaign (-.015) *
5. Kane (-.013)*
6 Rock Island (-.011) *
7. Kankakee (-.009) *
8. Peoria (-.007) *
9. Pulaski *
10. Alexander *
11. Pope *
12. Hardin *
13. Gallatin *
14. Greene *
15. Brown *
16. Hamilton *
17. Pike *
18. Massac *
19. Johnson *
20. Saline *
21. Clay *

SFY 84

1. Cook (-.062)
2. Madison (-.019) **
3. Winnebago (-.016) **
4. Will (-.016) **
5. Champaign (-.015) **
6. Sangamon (-.015) **
7. Macon (-.010) **
8. Kankakee (-.009) **
9. Jackson (-.009) **
10. Pulaski **
11. Alexander **
12. Pope **
13. Hardin **
14. Gallatin **
15. Greene **
16. Brown **
17. Hamilton **
18. Pike **
19. Massac**
20. Johnson **
21. Saline **
22. Clay **

Drug Abuse Programs

FFY 81

No data for Counties

FFY 83

1. Cook (-.044) ****
2. Champaign (-.013) ****
3. Lake (-.010) ****
4. DuPage (-.009)
5. Madison (-.009) ****
6. Will (-.008)
7. Rock Island (-.006) ****
8. Winnebago (-.005) ****
9. Macon **
10. Pulaski **
11. Alexander **
12. Pope **
13. Hardin **
14. Gallatin **
15. Brown **
16. Hamilton **
17. Pike **
18. Massac **
19. Johnson **
20. Saline **
21. Clay **

Title XX - Social Services - Total for Donated Funds Initiative

SFY 80	SFY 83
1. Cook (-.070) ****	1. Cook (-.097) ****
2. St. Clair (-.020) ****	2. St. Clair (-.033)****
3. Madison (-.008) ****	3. Madison (-.007) ****
4. DuPage (-.008)	4. Pulaski **
5. Pulaski *	5. Alexander **
6. Alexander *	6. Pope **
7. Pope *	7. Gallatin **
8. Gallatin *	8. Greene **
9. Greene *	9. Brown **
10. Brown *	10. Hamilton **
11. Hamilton *	11. Pike **
12. Pike *	12. Massac **
13. Massac *	13. Johnson **
14. Johnson *	14. Clay **
15. Clay *	

Title XX - Social Services - Donated Funds Initiative
Breakdown by Grants from the Department of Public Aid and Allied Agencies

SFY 80	SFY 83
DFI - Department on Aging	
1. Cook (-.412)	1. Cook (-.430)
2. Lake (-.017) *	2. St. Clair (-.021)
3. Winnebago (-.016) *	3. Lake (-.017) **
4. DuPage (-.016) *	4. Will (-.016) **
5. Rock Island (-.011) *	5. DuPage (-.016) **
6. Macon (-.010) *	6. Rock Island (-.011) **
7. Kankakee (-.009) *	7. Macon (-.010) **
8. St. Clair (-.007)	8. Kankakee (-.009) **
9. Pulaski **	9. Winnebago (-.005)
10. Alexander *	10. Pulaski **
11. Pope *	11. Alexander **
12. Gallatin *	12. Pope **
13. Greene *	13. Gallatin **
14. Brown *	13. Green **
15. Hamilton *	15. Brown **
16. Pike *	16. Hamilton **
17. Massac *	17. Pike **
18. Johnson *	18. Massac **
19. Saline *	19. Johnson **
20. Clay *	21. Clay **

SFY 80

SFY 83

DFI - Department of Children and Family Services

1. Cook (-.195) ****
2. St. Clair (-.037) *
3. DuPage (-.016) *
4. Will (-.016) *
5. Kane (-.013) *
6. Sangamon (-.012) *
7. Madison (-.009) ****
8. Pulaski *
9. Alexader *
10. Pope *
11. Hardin *
12. Gallatin *
13. Greene *
14. Brown *
15. Hamilton *
16. Pike *
17. Massac *
18. Johnson *
19. Clay *

1. Cook (-.152)
2. St. Clair (-.037) **
3. DuPage (-.016) **
4. Will (-.016) **
5. Kane (-.013) **
6. Sangamon (-.012) **
7. Pulaski **
8. Alexander **
9. Pope **
10. Hardin **
11. Gallatin **
12. Greene **
13. Brown **
14. Hamilton **
15. Pike **
16. Massac **
17. Johnson **
18. Saline **
19. Clay **

DFI - Commission on Delinquency Prevention/DCFS

1. Cook (-.081)
2. St. Clair (-.023)
3. DuPage (-.016) *
4. Kane (-.013) *
5. Sangamon (-.012) *
6. Pulaski *
7. Alexander *
8. Pope *
9. Hardin *
10. Gallatin *
11. Greene *
12. Brown *
13. Hamilton *
14. Pike *
15. Massac *
16. Johnson *
17. Clay

1. St. Clair (-.037) **
2. Cook (-.034)
3. Lake (-.017) **
4. DuPage (-.016) **
5. Kane (-.013) **
6. Sangamon (-.012) **
7. Kankakee (-.009) **
8. Pulaski **
9. Alexander **
10. Pope **
11. Hardin **
12. Gallatin **
13. Greene **
14. Brown **
15. Hamilton **
16. Pike **
17. Massac **
18. Johnson **
19. Clay **

DFI - Department of Corrections

SFY 80

1. Madison (-.019) *
2. Lake (-.017) *
3. Winnebago (-.016) *
4. Du Page (-.016)*
5. Champaign (-.015) *
6. Peoria (-.015) *
7. Rock Island (-.011) *
8. Kankakee (-.009) *
9. Jackson (-.009) *
10. Will (-.006)
11. Pulaski *
12. Alexander *
13. Pope *
14. Hardin *
15. Gallatin *
16. Greene *
17. Brown *
18. Hamilton *
19. Pike *
20. Massac *
21. Johnson *
22. Saline *
23. Clay *

SFY 83

1. St. Clair (-.029)
2. Madison (-.019) **
3. Lake (-.017) **
4. Winnebago (-.016) **
5. DuPage (-.016) **
6. Rock Island (-.011)**
7. Macon (-.010) **
8. Kankakee (-.009) **
9. Pulaski **
10. Alexander **
11. Pope **
12. Hardin **
13. Gallatin **
14. Greene **
15. Brown **
16. Hamilton **
17. Pike **
18. Massac **
19. Johnson **
20. Saline **
21. Clay **

DFI - Dangerous Drugs Commission

1. Cook (-.070) ****
2. Winnebago (-.016) *
3. Will (-.016) *
4. Du Page (-.015) *
5. Champaign (-.015) *
6. Peoria (-.015)*
7. Kane (-.013) *
8. Rock Island (-.011) *
9. Macon (-.010) *
10. Pulaski *
11. Alexander *
12. Pope *
13. Hardin *
14. Gallatin *
15. Greene *
16. Brown *
17. Hamilton *
18. Pike *
19. Massac *
20. Johnson *
21. Saline *
22. Clay *

1. Cook (-.378) ****
2. Du Page (-.016) **
3. Champaign (-.015) **
4. Kane (-.013) **
5. Rock Island (-.011) **
6. Macon (-.010) **
7. Pulaski **
8. Alexander **
9. Pope **
10. Hardin **
11. Gallatin **
12. Greene **
13. Brown **
14. Hamilton **
15. Pike **
16. Massac **
17. Johnson **
18. Saline **
19. Clay **

DFI - Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities

SFY 80

1. Cook (-.092)
2. St. Clair (-.026)
3. Lake (-.006)
4. Pulaski *
5. Alexander *
6. Pope*
7. Hardin *
8. Gallatin *
9. Greene *
10. Brown *
11. Hamilton*
12. Pike *
13. Massac *
14. Johnson *
15. Saline *
16. Clay *

SFY 83

1. Cook (-.136) ****
2. St. Clair (-.029)
3. Winnebago (-.016) **
4. Kankakee (-.009) **
5. Pulaski **
6. Alexander **
7. Pope **
8. Hardin **
9. Gallatin **
10. Greene **
11. Brown **
12. Hamilton **
13. Pike **
14. Massac **
15. Johnson **
16. Saline **

DFI - Department of Public Aid

1. St. Clair (-.037) *
2. Madison (-.019) *
3. Winnebago (-.016) *
4. DuPage (-.016) *
5. Peoria (-.015) *
6. Kane (-.013) *
7. Rock Island (-.011) *
8. Macon (-.010) *
9. Kankakee (-.009) *
10. Jackson (-.009) *
11. Lake (-.005)
12. Champaign (-.005)
13. Pulaski *
14. Alexander *
15. Pope *
16. Hardin *
17. Gallatin *
18. Greene *
19. Brown *
20. Hamilton *
21. Pike *
22. Massac *
23. Johnson *
24. Saline *
25. Clay *

1. Cook (-.100)
2. St. Clair (-.037) **
3. Madison (-.019) **
4. Winnegabo (-.016) **
5. Will (-.016) **
6. DuPage (-.016) **
7. Peoria (-.015) **
8. Kane (-.013) **
9. Rock Island (-.011) **
10. Macon (-.010) **
11. Kankakee (-.009) **
12. Jackson (-.009) **
13. Lake (-.008)
14. Pulaski **
15. Alexander **
16. Pope **
17. Hardin **
18. Gallatin **
19. Greene **
20. Brown **
21. Hamilton **
22. Pike **
23. Massac **
24. Johnson **
25. Saline **
26. Clay **

DFI - Department of Vocational Rehabilitation/ Department of Rehabilitation Services

SFY 80

1. St. Clair (-.037) *
2. Madison (-.019) *
3. Lake (-.017) *
4. Winnebago (-.016) *
5. Will (-.016) *
6. DuPage (-.016) *
7. Champaign (-.015) *
8. Peoria (-.015) *
9. Kane (-.013) *
10. Sangamon (-.012) *
11. Rock Island (-.011) *
12. Kankakee (-.009) *
13. Jackson (-.009) *
14. Pulaski *
15. Alexander *
16. Pope *
17. Hardin *
18. Gallatin *
19. Geeene *
20. Brown *
21. Hamilton *
22. Pike *
23. Massac *
24. Johnson *
25. Saline *
26. Clay *

SFY 83

1. St. Clair (-.037) **
2. Madison (-.019) **
3. Lake (-.017) **
4. Winnebago (-.016) **
5. Will (-.016) **
6. DuPage (-.016) **
7. Champaign (-.015) **
8. Peoria (-.015) **
9. Kane (-.013) **
10. Sangamon (-.012) **
11. Rock Island (-.011) **
12. Kankakee (-.009) **
13. Jackson (-.009) **
14. Pulaski **
15. Alexander **
16. Pope **
17. Hardin **
18. Gallatin **
19. Greene **
20. Brown **
21. Hamilton **
22. Pike **
23. Massac **
24. Johnson **
25. Saline **
26. Clay *

B. For the following grant programs, some of the counties studied received considerably more than their fair share (a difference of +.005 or more between a county's proportion of poor persons and its proportion of federal funds). Differences are in parentheses.

Energy Assistance

FFY 81	FFY 83
1. Peoria (+.010)	None
2. Kankakee (+.007)	

Community Services

FFY 81	FFY 83
1. Cook (+.171)	1. Cook (+.087)
2. St. Clair (+.009)	2. Pulaski (+.007)
	3. Lake (+.005)
	4. Winnebago (+.005)

Maternal and Child Health

FFY 81	FFY 84
None	None

Preventive Health and Health Services

1. Peoria (+.030)	1. DuPage (+.022)
2. Massac (+.023) *****	2. Lake (+.013)
3. Clay (+.005)	3. Winnebago (+.009)
	4. Peoria (+.005)
	5. Sangamon (+.005)

Mental Health

1. Sangamon (+.087)	1. Kane (+.064)
2. DuPage (+.042)	2. Peoria (+.047)
3. Jackson (+.031)	3. DuPage (+.037)
4. Winnebago (+.023)	4. Lake (+.014)
5. Will (+.017)	5. St. Clair (+.009)
6. St. Clair (+.016)	

Drug Abuse Programs

FFY 81	FFY 83
No data for Counties	1. Peoria (+.019) ****
	2. Jackson (+.008) ****

Title XX - Social Services - Total For Donated Funds Initiative

SFY 80

1. Sangamon (+.081) ******
2. Jackson (+.028)
3. Macon (+.017)
4. Lake (+.015) ****
5. Winnebago (+.008)
6. Kane (+.005)
7. Kankakee (+.005)
8. Peoria (+.005)

SFY 83

1. Sangamon (+.097) ******
2. Jackson (+.037)
3. Peoria (+.011) ****
4. Macon (+.006)
5. Lake (+.006) ****
6. Rock Island (+.005)

Title XX - Social Services - Donated Funds Initiative- Breakdown by Grants from the Department of Public and Allied Agencies

DFI - Department on Aging

1. Peoria (+.096)
2. Will (+.039)
3. Jackson (+.032)
4. Sangamon (+.026)
5. Kane (+.020)
6. Champaign (+.019)
7. Madison (+.019)
8. Hardin (+.012)

1. Peoria (+.062)
2. Sangamon (+.040)
3. Jackson (+.033)
4. Madison (+.033)
5. Champaign (+.019)
6. Hardin (+.013)
7. Kane (+.012)

DFI - Department of Children and Family Services

1. Jackson (+.0191)
2. Lake (+.145)
3. Rock Island (+.035)
4. Kankakee (+.025)
5. Saline (+.021)
6. Winnebago (+.021)
7. Peoria (+.014)

1. Jackson (+.219)
2. Lake (+.078)
3. Rock Island (+.043)
4. Peoria (+.018)
5. Macon (+.009)
6. Winnebago (+.007)

DFI - Commission on Delinquency Prevention/DCFS

1. Winnebago (+.089)
2. Peoria (+.039)
3. Saline (+.028)
4. Macon (+.019)
5. Champaign (+.016)
6. Kankakee (+.016)
7. Lake (+.006)

1. Winnebago (+.071)
2. Jackson (+.045)
3. Peoria (+.044)
4. Saline (+.020)
5. Macon (+.018)

DFI - Department of Corrections

SFY 80	SFY 83
1. Kane (+.071)	1. Cook (+.217)
2. Cook (+.052)	2. Sangamon (+.037)
3. Macon (+.052)	3. Champaign (+.029)
4. St. Clair (+.049)	4. Will (+.023)
5. Sangamon (+.036)	5. Kane (+.011)
	6. Peoria (+.011)
	7. Jackson (+.008)

DFI - Dangerous Drugs Commission

1. Kankakee (+.058	1. Kankakee (+.041)
2. Jackson (+.029)	2. Lake (+.029) ****
	3. Jackson (+.019)
	4. Winnebago (+.019)
	5. Peoria (+.011)

DFI - Department of Mental Health and Deve-opmental Disabilities

1. Macon (+.029)	1. DuPage (+.031)
2. Rock Island (+.016)	2. Macon (+.030)
3. Sangamon (+.015)	3. Rock Island (+.019)
4. DuPage (+.014)	4. Will (+.015)
5. Winnebago (+.014)	5. Kane (+.014)
6. Will (+.0.0)	6. Sangamon (+.011)
7. Champaign (+.007)	7. Peoria (+.006)
8. Kane (+.007)	
9. Peoria (+.005)	

DFI - Department of Public Aid

1. Sangamon (+.369) ******	1. Sangamon (+.492) ******
2. Will (+.009)	

DFI - Department of Vocational Rehabilitation/ Department of Rehabilitation Services

1. Cook (+.272)	1. Cook (+.315)
2. Macon (+.076)	2. Macon (+.013)

C. For the following grant programs, some counties received a portion of grants allocated to agencies serving more than one county. These counties received no other grant to a local administering agency for the designated grant program.

Federal Categorical Grant	State Block Grant
Energy Assistance	
FFY 81	FFY 83
1. Winnebago	None
2. Will	
3. DuPage	
4. Kane	
5. Sangamon	
6. Rock Island	
7. Jackson	
8. Pulaski	
9. Alexander	
10. Pope	
11. Hardin	
12. Gallatin	
13. Greene	
14. Brown	
15. Hamilton	
16. Pike	
17. Massac	
18. Johnson	
19. Saline	
20. Clay	
Community Services	
1. Rock Island	None
2. Pulaski	
3. Alexander	
4. Gallatin	
5. Greene	
6. Hamilton	
7. Massac	
8. Johnson	
9. Saline	
10. Clay	

Maternal and Child Health

FFY 81	FFY 84
1. Will	1. Pulaski
	2. Alexander
	3. Pope
	4. Hardin
	5. Gallatin
	6. Massac
	7. Johnson
	8. Saline

Preventive Health and Health Services

1. Pulaski	1. Pulaski
2. Alexander	2. Alexander
3. Pope	3. Pope
4. Hardin	4. Hardin
5. Gallatin	5. Gallatin
6. Johnson	6. Massac
7. Saline	7. Johnson
	8. Saline

Mental Health

None	None

Drug Abuse Programs

FFY 81	FFY 83
No data	1. St. Clair

Title XX - Social Services: Donated Funds Initiative

FFY 80	SFY 83
Department on Aging	
None	None
Department of Children and Family Services	
1. Champaign	1. Madison 2. Champaign
Commission on Delinquency Prevention - DCFS	
None	None
Department of Corrections	
None	None
Dangerous Drugs Commission	
1. St. Clair 2. Lake 3. Sangamon	1. St. Clair 2. Sangamon
Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities	
None	None
Department of Public Aid	
None	None
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation/ Department of Rehabilitation Services	
None	None

Notes

* No agency in this county received a categorical grant for this program.

** No agency in this county received a block grant for this program.

*** This county is one of three counties for which the total proportion of Illinois' poverty population was .016, while their proportion of the categorical grants to Illinois agencies for Community Services was .010, a negative difference of (-.006).

**** This county was served by one or more agencies with sites in two or more counties. Data on how these agencies distributed their grants to the sites in these counties were not provided. Therefore, how these funds affected the county's share is not known. For more information, see footnote for the pertinent table.

***** This county is also one of seven counties served by a health department which had received a grant in the fair share range (not more than a + or - .005 difference from the total proportion of the poverty population for the seven counties).

****** An organization with headquarters in this county distributed funds from this DPA-DFI grant to various service centers throughout the state. Data on where and how these funds were distributed were not provided.

COUNTIES IN ILLINOIS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Department of Research and Advocacy
Hull House Association
118 N. Clinton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 726-1526

JUNE 1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE